DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 172 834 IR 007 654

AUTHOR	Waddock, Sandra A.; And Others
TITLE	Final Report of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services.
INSTITUTION	Massachusetts State Board of Library Commissioners, Boston.
PUB DATE	May 79
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Business Responsibility; *Citizen Participation; Community Surveys; Copyrights; *Government Role; *Library Automation; Library Collections; Library Cooperation; Library Facilities; *Library Networks; *Library Planning; *Library Role
IDENTIFIERS	Massachusetts

ABSTRACT

This comprehensive report of the pre-White House Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services includes background and planning information, a summary of events and speeches at the conference, and the resolutions resulting from the conference. Participants were predominantly lay people with some representatives of the library/information science community. The conference was designed to focus public attention on the need for information services, on the problems of access to information, on the role of libraries in providing information, and to fix responsibility for making plans and taking appropriate action. Planned by the Citizens' Advisory Committee, consisting of lay delegates and librarians, the conference was coordinated by a Core Committee representing library associations and types of libraries. Pre-conference activities included surveys of public library users and non-users, regional meetings, and public forums. The Conference addressed the issues of library role; present and future technologies; responsibilities of the private sector and federal, regional, and local governments; library cooperation and networks; library resources; copyright; and relationships among users, libraries, and the private sector. Results were coordinated by a resolutions committee. Excerpts of speeches, subcommittee reports, and questionnaire results are appended. (CWM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED172834

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Final Report of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services

Held: April 26-27, 1978 in Boston
March 27, 1979 in Worcester

by Sandra A. Waddock
Conference Coordinator

Edited by Patricia Sheehan,
with Laurel Ackles and Dorothy Ladd

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Leonard

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

May 1979
Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
648 Beacon Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

IR001654

Foreword

Not often do "ordinary" folks have the opportunity to work as a team with a group of professionals to change and mold access to information and use of it in terms of its significance as a national resource. But that is exactly what the role of the voting delegates to the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services is--and we are fortunate that we have been able to participate in this democratic process.

When my father, Channing L. Bete, Sr., first proposed a national conference on libraries more than 20 years ago, he had little idea that it would come to fruition so magnificently. The April 1978 Massachusetts Governor's Conference was the fourth of the pre-White House Conferences scheduled before May 1979 in each of the 58 states and territories. The Governor's Conference really got its start following the establishment of a National Commission of Libraries and Information Science. One of the most important things about this Commission is its commitment to the ideal that the public--the persons on the street--ought to have an opportunity to come forward to share their particular concerns in the areas of libraries and information services.

That we could draw our voting delegation from such a board cross section, representative of various socio-economic categories, interested lay people and numerous civic, social and educational organizations, as well as librarians and information scientists, is truly meaningful. The four previous Massachusetts Governor's Conferences on Libraries have been composed entirely of librarians and trustees. The inclusion of representatives of the general populace meant that the theme of our Conference, "Libraries for the People--By the People," could, in fact, be fulfilled.

We are very proud of the results of the first session of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services--32 resolutions passed by the delegation covering all the scheduled workshop topics, plus the concerns of individuals submitted by those individuals, and additionally, those of a group of people who gathered together to form a Grassroots Workshop. Nevertheless, we are aware that at the close of this Conference much work remains to be done.

All the issues that have been decided at the Massachusetts Governor's Conference will be carried to the White House Conference in the fall of 1979 by our 13 elected voting delegates. Key citizens, legislators, and librarians in Massachusetts must then be made aware of these resolutions in order that they might have a real impact on the future of our libraries. This is the

challenge, and the opportunity, that we as delegates to the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services face. Yet even as we look to the future, we know that we have made a remarkable beginning, a beginning that can lead to a brighter tomorrow for libraries, and more significantly, for library users.

Channing L. Bete, Jr.
Chairman

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....1
Background
Goals and Objectives of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference
Significance of the Governor's Conference

II. The Planning Stages.....3
Core Committee
Citizens' Advisory Committee
Subcommittees

III. Pre-Conference Activities.....7
A Survey of Public Library Users
Regional Meetings
Relationship with NCLIS
Citizen Survey

IV. The Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services.....10
April 26-27, 1978
March 27, 1979

V. Issues and Recommendations.....13
Resolutions

VI. Delegates to the National White House Coference.....25

VII. Post State Conference Activity.....27

VIII. Evaluation.....28

IX. Financial Report.....31

APPENDICES

A. Planning Document of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services...34

B. Core Committee.....36

C. Citizens' Advisory Committee.....37

D. Subcommittee Reports.....40
Finance--by Lydia R. Goodhue
Conference Kit--by Sandra J. Souza
Program--by Richard W. Trueswell
Public Relations--by Lawrence Pickard
Site Selection--by Robert Stueart, Ph.D.
Participant-Recruitment--by Janet R. London
Speak Outs for Libraries--by Margaret (Jims) Murphy

E. Workshop Topics and Leaders.....48

F. Compiled Results of Survey of Massachusetts Public Library Users--by J. Worth Estes, M.D.....50

Citizen Survey Report--by Peter S. Fellenz and Peter L. Fenton.....51

G. Governor's Conference Poster.....55

H. Speak Out Planning Committee.....56

I. Program of the Governor's Conference
April 26-27, 1978.....57
March 27, 1979.....60

J. Voting Delegates to the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services.62

Table of Contents (Continued)

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECHES ON APRIL 26-27, 1978

K. Welcoming Remarks--by Rev. John R. Aherne, O.S.A., Chairman, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners.....65

L. Greetings of the Commonwealth--by Paul Parks, Secretary of Educational Affairs.....67

M. Libraries in Today's World--by Oscar Handlin, Ph.D., The Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor, Harvard.....68

N. The Cutting Edge: Library Services in the Future--by John N. Berry, III, Editor, Library Journal.....72

O. What Library Users Think: Report on Survey of Massachusetts Library Users --by J. Worth Estes, M.D., Associate Professor of Pharmacology, Boston University School of Medicine.....78

P. Challenge to the Delegates--by Governor Michael S. Dukakis, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.....85

Q. Tabulated Results of the Evaluation of the Governor's Conference, April 26-27, 1978.....87

I Introduction

Background

Prior to the pre-White House Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services, the Commonwealth had held four Governor's Conferences on Libraries in 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. Conducted under the auspices of the Board of Library Commissioners (then called the Bureau of Library Extension, Department of Education of the Commonwealth), these Governor's Conferences brought together librarians and trustees from all over Massachusetts.

Unlike previous Governor's Conferences, the 1978 pre-White House Conference was not composed primarily of representatives of the library/information science community. Instead, following guidelines set forth by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the 1978 Conference's 180 voting delegates were predominantly lay people.

When the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science was established in 1974, it was strongly committed to the ideal that became the theme of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services--"Libraries for the People--By the People." Throughout the delegate selection process for the Massachusetts Governor's Conference, the planning of the conference program and its implementation, this ideal was kept in mind. The Conference slogan, "No Silence, Please. Speak Up for Libraries," further attested to the desire of the planners to receive input from citizens throughout the Commonwealth.

Because Massachusetts was only the fourth of all the state/territorial level conferences to be scheduled, its experience in the Commonwealth was necessarily one of trial and error. Nonetheless, citizen input was strong and a large number of recommendations emerged.

Goals and Objectives of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference

Suggested objectives for the Governor's Conference were formulated by the Core Committee. These suggestions, as subsequently adopted by the Citizens' Committee were:

A. THE PURPOSE OF THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE is to stimulate users and potential users of libraries and information centers within Massachusetts--to involve themselves in the further improvement of these libraries and information centers and their use by the public.

The Conference is designed to focus public attention on the need for information services, on the problems of access to information, on the role of libraries in providing information; and to fix responsibility for making plans and taking appropriate action.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ARE:

1) To identify the public's needs for information and library services.

2) To determine how effectively these needs are being met with current resources and services.

3) To identify what additional services are needed and which ones can realistically be provided.

4) To propose a plan of action which will (a) delineate areas of responsibility on the local, state and national levels, including the public and private sectors, and will (b) meet the needs of the public for library and information services, and will be responsible for (c) promoting broad-based support and (d) effecting necessary legislation, organizational and fiscal reforms to achieve these goals.

5) To disseminate the results of the Governor's Conference to the residents of Massachusetts, and to carry its message to the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services.

For a synopsis of both Massachusetts and national issues considered, see the Planning Document, Appendix A.

Significance of the Governor's Conference

Bringing together the lay and library communities into a single forum to discuss and consider the concerns of libraries and their users was one of the most significant aspects of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference. For perhaps the first time, librarians in this state met in conference with a group of interested lay persons to discuss the future of their libraries and information services. This was done in a setting in which all of the delegates could consider issues related to local, statewide, and national issues relevant to libraries and attempt to reconcile the goals of these various segments of the world of libraries and information services.

II The Planning Stages

A. Core Committee

A Core Committee representing library associations and types of libraries began the planning process more than two years before the Spring 1978 Conference. Names of its members are listed in Appendix B.

The Core Committee prepared a planning document suggesting purposes, objectives and issues for the Governor's Conference. It also prepared slates for use by the Governor's office in its selection of a Citizens Advisory Committee. Throughout the planning stages, it served as a steering committee with representation on each of the sub-committees.

B. Citizens' Advisory Committee

In a State House ceremony on October 5, 1977, the Governor swore in the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC). In addition to the ten members of the Core Committee who represented library interests, the CAC consisted of lay delegates representing such groups as religious institutions, publishing, schools, the handicapped, businesses and professions, Friends of Libraries, academic institutions, and students as well as librarians from other types of libraries.

CAC members came from throughout Massachusetts. In accordance with NCLIS guidelines for the Governor's Conference itself, the CAC was composed predominantly of lay persons with an interest in libraries. Members of the CAC are listed in Appendix C.

Governor Michael S. Dukakis appointed Channing L. Bete, Jr., chairman of the Citizen's Advisory Committee and set the date for the Massachusetts Conference for April 26-27, 1978. Following the swearing-in ceremony, the CAC was greeted by Secretary for Educational Affairs Paul Parks; Solomon Rosenbaum, Esq., member of the Board of Library Commissioners; and listened to a key-

note speech by Mrs. Bessie Boehm Moore of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. A slide tape called "Libraries for the People--By the People," produced by the Board of Library Commissioners to stimulate interest in the Governor's Conference was then shown to the CAC.

Following the "Charge to the Committee" by Dr. M. Virginia Biggy, member of the Board of Library Commissioners, the CAC heard presentations of background information on "People and Money" by Nancy Jacobson, director, Memorial Hall Library, Andover; "Machines and Information" by Richard Casabonne of Cinema, Inc., and Patricia Sheehan, of the Masachusetts Institute of Technology; and on "Access and Use" by Edward D. Pearce, Boston Museum of Science Library, and Peter Fenton, librarian at Boston State College.

The presentations were followed by a working session at which officers of the CAC were elected and subcommittee assignments were made. The officers were: Chairman, Channing L. Bete, Jr., President of Channing L. Bete Company in Greenfield; Vice Chairman, J. Worth Estes, M.D., Associate Professor of Pharmacology at Boston University Medical School; and Secretary, Laurel Ackles, representing health science libraries. The CAC recognized the need for a conference coordinator immediately and set into motion through the Board of Library Commissioners the necessary paperwork. The actual hiring of the coordinator did not take place, however, until February 1978.

C. Subcommittees

The Governor's Conference was planned by the 46 member CAC under the leadership of Chairman Bete. Coordinating all the activities of the subcommittee was Sandra A. Waddock who was hired by the Board of Library Commissioners effective February 6, 1978 on a part-time basis. In recognition of the far-reaching potential effects of this conference on the Board's task for library development, the Board of Library Commissioners, under the guidance of Acting Director Alice M. Cahill, allotted full staff time and production facilities to make this conference a success. The CAC was separated into six subcommittees, whose members were taken from those volunteering to serve in specific functions. Each committee's work was supported by at least one Core Committee member's presence, although chairpersons were, for the most part, lay:

1) Participant Recruitment

Co-Chairpersons: Janet London
Director
Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts
Worcester

Dan C. Pinck
President
Dan C. Pinck Associates
Belmont

2) Public Relations

Chairperson: Lawrence Pickard
Vice President
Boston Broadcasters, Inc.
Needham

3) Finance and Exhibits

Chairperson: Lydia R. Goodhue
Civic Leader
Wellesley

4) Program Content

Chairperson: Richard W. Trueswell
Professor
Industrial Engineering
University of Massachusetts
Amherst

Vice Chairperson: Judith Ganak
Administrator
Palmer and Dodge
Boston

5) Conference Kit

Chairperson: Sandra J. Souza
Librarian
Massachusetts Correctional
Institution
Bridgewater

6) Site Arrangements

Chairperson: Robert Stueart, Ph.D.
Dean
Simmons Graduate School
of Library Science
Boston

7) Speak Out for Libraries

Superchairpersons: Margaret (Jims) Murphy
Chief Librarian
U.S. Army Materials
and Mechanics
Research Center
Watertown

Dudley A. Weiss
Executive Director
Library Binding Institute
Boston

Boston 1: John Linford
Director, NELINET
Wellesley

Felice Forrest
Library Services Manager
Little, Brown & Company
Boston

Boston 2: Robert Stueart, Ph.D.
Dean
Simmons Graduate School
of Library Science
Boston

Helen Lavoie
Homemaker
Sandwich

Lowell: Richard Arcand
Data Manager
Raytheon Company
North Chelmsford

Nancy Jacobson
Director
Memorial Hall Library
Andover

New Bedford: Sandra Souza
Librarian
Massachusetts Correctional Institution
Fall River

Marjory Ruby Dottin
Director
Upward Bound Program
New Bedford

Pittsfield: Larry Price
Assistant Director
Berkshire Athenaeum
Pittsfield

Isabel Jensen
Librarian
McCann Regional School
North Adams

Springfield: Constance Clancy
Director
South Hadley Library System
South Hadley

Dorothy J. Pryor
Affirmative Action/ Equal Opportunity Officer
Springfield Technical Community College
Springfield

Worcester: William Joyce
Director
American Antiquarian Society
Worcester

Daniel F. Toomey
Assistant District Attorney
Office of District Attorney
Holden

8) Spring Meeting

Co-Chairpersons: Charles Husbands
Systems Librarian
Harvard University Libraries
Cambridge

Janet London
Director
Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts
Worcester

The work of the CAC is conveniently summarized in the reports of its several subcommittees, compiled as Appendix D.

III. Pre-Conference Activities

A Survey of Public Library Users

A survey of library users throughout the Commonwealth was prepared by the Core Committee in the fall of 1977. Summaries of the survey results, prepared by J. Worth Estes, M.D., vice chairperson of the Conference, were sent to all delegates prior to the Conference. Full results were presented in written and oral form and were thus incorporated into workshop discussions. The unabridged report was made available to the CAC, to delegates through the resource table, to certain statewide organizations and to anyone else requesting it, as well as to those libraries that participated in the survey.

The survey was also one of the key elements in obtaining citizen participation in the Governor's Conference. Citizens, who filled out the questionnaire and were interested in attending the Conference, were asked to submit their ideas to the Participant-Recruitment Subcommittee. From this group, a significant portion of the voting delegates was culled.

Twenty percent of 8400 questionnaires that were distributed to a representative sampling of public libraries throughout the state were returned and analyzed. It was believed that those surveys returned were entirely representative of the state's population and size of library services offered, although communities with "active" library services were also more likely to participate in the survey. Compiled results of the survey can be found in Appendix F and more complete discussion of the survey can be found in Appendix O.

Regional Meetings

Because the Governor's Conference was scheduled at the Governor's request for April 26-27, 1978, there was no time to plan for regional meetings prior to the first session of the Conference. The Citizens' Advisory Committee decided to plan for regional meetings throughout the state to be held sometime in between the first and the final session of the Conference.

During October 1978 a series of seven regional "Speak Outs for Libraries" was held in six major cities of Massachusetts to bring

the work of the Governor's Conference to public attention and to find out what the concerns of users and potential users were. Governor Michael S. Dukakis proclaimed October as "Library Speak Out Awareness Month" to aid in publicizing the regional meetings, which were held in Boston (two), Haverhill, New Bedford, Pittsfield, Springfield, and Worcester. Membership of the planning committee for the Speak Outs is included as Appendix H.

The seven Speak Outs were introduced by one of the two co-chairpersons, and then run as open forums. Citizens were encouraged to express their views about libraries or state their concerns. Press releases, regionalized for local distributions, were mailed to newspapers and radio stations prior to the Speak Outs; public service announcements were distributed to Massachusetts radio stations; and mailings made to major employees of Massachusetts and all librarians included on the Board of Library Commissioner's mailing lists, requesting help with publicizing these events. Delegates and librarians were asked to distribute flyers about the Speak Out events. Despite these efforts to interest citizens in discussing concerns about libraries, attendance at the Speak Outs were disappointing. At the best attended, approximately 40 persons came to speak out, while a majority of Speak Outs had about 25-35 persons in attendance, many of whom were librarians or trustees.

Following the final Speak Out, the planning committee met to determine whether or not new issues had been raised that should be presented in the form of resolutions to the delegates at the March 27 meeting. A total of 14 new resolutions was developed by this committee, and many existing resolutions received support from those attending the Speak Outs. One issue that was addressed at every Speak Out was the need for libraries to increase their public relations and publicity efforts, thus a strong resolution on public relations was included among the 14 new ones.

Relationship with NCLIS

With the Massachusetts Governor's Conference held as one of the first in the nation and the CAC working under tremendous time pressures to get all of the necessary work done before substantial guidelines by the National Commission were disseminated, it was often necessary for the CAC to make decisions about the Conference based on experience and commonsense.

Citizen Survey

Certain of the delegates attending the the first session of the Governor's Conference were unsatisfied with the results of the survey of public library users undertaken by the Core

Committee, feeling that it did not accurately reflect the opinion of nonlibrary users. A resolution passed at the first session therefore mandated that a second survey, using public polling techniques, take place in the interim between the first and final sessions and that the results be shared with delegates.

Two delegates, Peter Fenton, a member of the CAC, and Peter Fellenz, a lay delegate, co-chaired the committee that developed and implemented a random telephone sampling of Massachusetts citizens. All of the delegates and observers at the first session were asked to help in carrying out this random sampling of citizens. The survey itself consisted of four basic questions related to library use; 140 communities and 650 citizens participated in the survey.

The survey showed that about 35% of the population never or seldom uses libraries; another 22% uses them infrequently; and about 43% are fairly regular users. More than half (53%) of those who do use libraries use them for pleasure, while 23% use them for business, and 24% for other reasons. Results of the Survey are included as part of Exhibit F, following the results of the survey of public library users.

IV. The Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services April 26-27, 1978-1979

A copy of the voting program is included in Appendix I. The voting delegates (see Appendix J) to the Governor's Conference had been screened for library affiliation prior to the conference. They represented a wide variety of backgrounds and interests, including the institutionalized, the handicapped, the disadvantaged, non-users, ethnic minorities, community activists, and homemakers, as well as professionals in various occupations, business people, administrators, and, of course, librarians from all types of libraries.

Among the speakers at the first plenary session of the Governor's Conference were Pulitzer Prize winner Oscar Handlin, Ph.D., chairman of the Harvard Library Committee, who discussed "Libraries in Today's World"; John N. Berry III, editor of Library Journal, who covered "The Cutting Edge: Library Services in the Future"; and J. Worth Estes, M.D., associate professor of pharmacology at Boston University School of Medicine, who reported on the results of the survey of Massachusetts Library Users conducted by the Core Committee. Excerpts from major addresses at the conference are included in Appendices K,L,M,N,O,P.

Other speakers included those who introduced specific workshops to plenary sessions of the delegates: Keyes Metcalf, director emeritus of Harvard University Libraries, who introduced "Federal, Regional, and Local Responsibilities"; Virginia A. Tashjian, director of the Newton Free Library, who discussed "The Real Roles of the Library: What Should They Be?" ; and Patricia Sheehan, systems designer at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology introducing "Present and Future Technologies." Dr. Harold Edgerton of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the "Father of the Strobe," gave an entertaining and informative presentation at the banquet.

At the Conference, the entire delegation attended plenary sessions on three basic topics: the real roles of the library; present and future technologies; and responsibilities of the private sector and the federal, regional, and local governments. After each introduction, the delegation split into seven pre-assigned

groups, each comprising a cross-section of delegates. Results from the seven groups were coordinated by a resolutions committee. Following the same format, but meeting concurrently, another four sessions were on library cooperation and networks; library resources--building,collections; copyright; and relationships among users, libraries and the private sector. On the first day of the Conference several delegates joined into a group, later called the Grassroots Workshop, and held a session dealing largely with community participation and access.

Particularly in the workshops, the discussion leaders faced the problem of explaining complicated subjects to lay delegates unfamiliar with library terminology. The problem was compounded by the shortness of time on workshops and the disparity in knowledge levels between professional librarians and lay delegates.

Some 48 resolutions emerged from the Resolutions Committee, Grassroots Workshop and from individuals. Delegates in the final voting session did not have enough time to complete their voting. Initially, resolutions from the scheduled workshops were given priority, but a 45-minute time period was allotted to resolutions from the Grassroots Workshop and individuals by a decision of the delegates during the course of the session.

In all, 32 resolutions were adopted by the final plenary session of delegates, three were vetoed, and 13 were deferred because of time constraints until the final session of the Conference scheduled for March 1979.

March 27, 1979 Session

Following the initial session of the Governor's Conference in April 1978, planning began for the final session to be held the next spring. The CAC decided that, with the permission of NCLIS, the final session would be held at Mechanics Hall in Worcester, a location more central than Boston. A committee with Janet London and Charles Husbands as co-chairpersons, with the support of the conference officers and members of the Citizens Advisory Committee, began planning for the March 27 session. Essentially a business meeting, the March 27 session had two purposes: to elect White House delegates and alternates and to resolve issues pending from the first session or introduced in the interim between the two sessions.

Publicity about the final session was generated through the publication of the Board of Library Commissioners, MediaWrite, which is distributed to all libraries in Massachusetts and releases were sent out about the appointment of co-chairpersons and others involved

in the planning process. Governor Edward J. King issued a proclamation two weeks before the final session making March 27 "Library and Information Services Day" in the Commonwealth. The same group of delegates that attended the first session were, of course, expected to attend the final meeting in Worcester.

Because of the long time delay between the two sessions of the Governor's Conference in Massachusetts, there was a high attrition rate among delegates. Of the original group of 180 voting delegates, 89 showed up at the Worcester meeting. About half of these were lay persons and half librarians.

As is indicated in the program reproduced in Appendix I, the day was split between the two orders of business. Each of the 24 candidates for White House Conference delegate, all of whom had been selected by a mail ballot to voting delegates, was given an opportunity to discuss his or her views and concerns for two minutes prior to the actual election, which was by secret written ballot.

With speeches and reports from the Speak Out committee and the Citizen Survey committee completed, the delegates began consideration of the 27 pending resolutions, old business, and five new resolutions before them. In all, 22 resolutions were added to the 32 that had been passed at the first session of the Governor's Conference. During the closing ceremonies, Chairman Bete informed the delegates that they would be receiving a copy of the complete set of resolutions and that as their final responsibility to the Governor's Conference, they would be asked to help set priorities for them.

V. Issues and Recommendations

Pre-conference activity for the Governor's Conference was centered around the development of issues to be considered by delegates. Initial discussion of key issues by the Core Committee led to a survey of library organizations, asking each to state those issues that it felt to be important to the Conference. Each professional library organization in the state was asked to submit a one-page "Statement of Concerns," which was later distributed to all of the delegates for their education and for consideration at the Conference.

As has been noted, a survey of public library users was undertaken by the Board of Library Commissioners at the request of the Core Committee. The results of this survey were presented to the delegates in summary fashion, orally at the initial plenary session and the complete survey results were available at the Conference.

Once issues had been delineated by these various sources, the Program Subcommittee reviewed them and presented a draft statement of topics to the entire Citizens' Advisory Committee for discussion and approval. The Program Subcommittee then broke into Topic Committees to draft suggested issues and resolutions for each topic. These issues for consideration were included on the program that was included with the Conference Kit and some of the Workshop Leaders also prepared suggested resolutions for consideration by delegates as a basis for starting the discussion.

The delegates were presented with background information for workshops at the Governor's Conference in the form of "Fact Sheets." During the actual working sessions delegates themselves prepared the resolutions by means of discussing chosen issues and coming to agreement on them. These resolutions were then coordinated by the Resolutions Committee, comprised of a lay delegate from each workshop along with a librarian, to eliminate overlap and inconsistency.

In addition to resolutions arising from pre-scheduled workshops, the Grassroots Workshop, which formed spontaneously to address issues of citizen participation in libraries, submitted several resolutions, some of which were passed by the delegation and others of which were left pending at the end of the plenary session. Individuals were also given an opportunity to submit resolutions at the final plenary session if they felt that their particular issue was not addressed in any of the existing resolutions.

According to Dorothy J. Pryor, a member

of the Citizens' Advisory Committee who served as a co-chair for one of the topics and as a substitute, last minute workshop leader, on The Real Role of the Library: What Should They Be?, "I tried to introduce questions that had the widest possible interest and to make sure that persons from different sectors and backgrounds had nearly equal time to express their views. It became obvious that the lay delegates were primarily interested in the needs of users and the possibilities of those needs being met by either new or exciting library facilities and techniques. The professionals at the Conference, on the other hand, were torn between their willingness to serve the public in additional new ways and their awareness of the problems inherent in expanded service--particularly the difficulties with funding and budgets.

"Many lay delegates seemed genuinely interested but somewhat overwhelmed by the vastness of both the possibilities and the problems of library use. Those delegates with particular points of view of special interests were by far the most vocal."

Another workshop leader and chair, William Joyce, on Library Resources--Buildings and Collections, indicated, "The delegates were interested in conservation of library materials and funding for library construction, but less so in the importance of promoting the most responsible and creative use of collections, and the importance, therefore, of resolving tension between privacy laws and freedom of information laws."

As is easily seen in the proliferation of resolutions by the Conference, the delegates tackled the manifold problems of libraries eagerly and were not hesitant to propose solutions.

Resolutions*

*Asterisked resolutions are among the top 10 priorities of the Massachusetts delegation.

TOPIC AREA I

Ensure that basic minimums of library and information services adequate to meet the needs of all communities are satisfied.

Issue A

How do we involve the public in the decision-making process?

Policy Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That the governing boards of libraries be required to establish and moniter the changing goals of services appropriate to their constituencies based on documented needs. Such goals will then provide a checklist for the continuing assessment of the library's role in its community.

2. RESOLVED: That the policy-making body of all libraries include in its membership representatives of all segments of the population which it is designed to serve.

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: Boards of trustees and administrators of public libraries should involve community residents and representatives of community organizations in the decision-making process concerning budgets and programming through such means as, but not limited to, public hearings, citizen review committees, and citizen audit committees, starting, when appropriate, at the local branch level.

Issue B

What is the state's responsibility for funding libraries and information services of all types?

Policy Recommendation

*1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services request that the General Court of Massachusetts fulfill its responsibility for funding and developing library services of the highest quality among all publicly supported library institutions, including public schools and academic libraries and those in state institutions.

Issue C

What responsibilities do governments on all levels share in providing adequate library and information facilities?

Program Recommendations

*1. RESOLVED: That adequate federal and state funding for library facilities be made available to support the growth of library collections and their maintenance for optimum reader usability. And further be it

RESOLVED: That the "construction" portion (Title II) of the Library Services and Construction Act receive renewed funding. And further be it

RESOLVED: That the building, construction, renovation, and addition portions of Chapter 764, Acts of 1974, be funded.

2. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services endorse an enhancement of normally offered public library reference services to include what is commonly referred to as information and referral services, and urge that local, state, and federal agencies give financial and moral support to this program.

3. RESOLVED: That the Massachusesetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services calls for legislation and guidelines to permit use of preferred rate lines by individual libraries and library consortia.

Issue D

How can libraries contribute to the quality of life and how should this be funded?

Program Recommendation

*1. Whereas the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services considers it a human right for each citizen to have access to libraries and information services as a source of personal growth and community enrichment, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: (1) That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services calls for an allocation of federal funds for the human services of libraries and information services; (2) the Massachusetts Governor's Conference asks that this allocation not cause an increase in present taxes, but that the present tax dollar be reallocated; (3) that libraries be viewed as educational institutions and that they be funded at a level commensurate with that role.

Issue E

What is the library's role in stimulating citizen participation in community and national affairs?

Policy Recommendation

1. Whereas the public library is a free public agency central to the citizen, and whereas the library has within its scope an entire realm of public and private information, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That libraries have an obligation to encourage and promote citizen participation in political, financial, and cultural affairs that affect the population.

Issue F

How can public awareness of library and information services be increased?

Policy Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That publicity and public education regarding existing library services and resources be increased.

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the American Library Association, the Massachusetts Library Association, and other national and state library organizations, and the Board of Library Commissioners in Massachusetts make national and state publicity of library services one of their primary goals and that they allocate an adequate proportion of their budgets to promote the services that are or should be available to all library consumer groups.

Issue G

What is the federal responsibility for assuring that information needs are met?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services propose that additional federal money be set aside to investigate appropriate, cost effective technologies which are responsive to the information needs of local populations, for example: skills exchanges, personal computing networks, and information referral services.

TOPIC AREA II

Provide adequate special services to special constituencies, including the unserved.

Issue A

What is the library's responsibility to special needs and non-user groups?

Policy Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services urges the expansion of library roles in order to reach those with special needs and non-users.

*2. RESOLVED: That the institutionalized have a right of access to adequately funded library and information services.

3. RESOLVED: That libraries recommit themselved to the ideal of literacy, not only in its usual association with the printed word, but in an extended sense, to encompass facilities in confronting non-print media as well.

Program Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference strongly urges the Governor, the Legislature, the state library development agency and board of trustees of local libraries to work in partnership with established literacy programs to implement effective basic reading and/or English as a second language tutorial programs in order to meet the libraries' obligation to reach out to a neglected constituency and create new users.

2. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services stimulate the publication of materials in support of adult literacy and adult basic education programs, not only in English, but also in Spanish, Portuguese, French, and other languages, such as sign language used by the deaf, used by a significant number of Massachusetts residents. Both print materials at very easy reading levels and high interest levels, and audio-visual materials which meet adult informational needs are required.

Issue B

What is the library's responsibility to the gifted child?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the library community take on the plight of the unserved gifted child and provide challenging activities of many forms in public and school libraries.

Issue C

How do we ensure that materials and equipment in libraries can be used by the handicapped?

Policy Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That all systems of technological application to library services involving print materials and intended for library patron use be designed to meet the needs of the blind and physically handicapped.

2. RESOLVED: That both federal and state agencies include in their policy guidelines for the granting of funds for research and development of equipment or materials involving audio and/or visual components, consideration of specific requirements or criteria for the selection of grants awards. The awarding process should consider the immediate or ready application and accessibility for utilization by users with sensory or physical disabilities. This is to reduce or avoid unnecessary expenditures of funds for spcial modifications of such equipment and materials.

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners should seek necessary state funding for the installation of telecommunications equipment for handicapped users in public libraries throughout the state.

Issue D

How should eligibility for talking and braille book programs be extended to the physically handicapped?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That Chapter 6, Section 129 and 130 of the Massachusetts General Laws should be amended by the addition of the physically handicapped to persons eligible for participation in the talking and braille book programs operated by the Massachusetts Commission for the Blind.

Issue E

How do we guarantee access to libraries for all people?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That federal and state funds should be provided to support branch libraries in low-income neighborhoods to guarantee access to library services for people who are unable to travel to central libraries because of age, health, lack of income, or lack of transportation, and that branch libraries should be supported as a means of saving energy used in transportation to central libraries, and that federal and state funds should be provided to construct central libraries accessible by mass transit as a means of social justice for transit-dependent low-income and elderly people and as a means of reducing energy consumed in travel to the libraries by car.

TOPIC AREA III

Strengthen statewide resources and systems.

Issue A

How can equality of educational opportunity be assured for all students?

Policy recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That secondary schools and public libraries be encouraged and expected to join in a cooperative effort statewide whereby students learn about the offerings and services of the public library to be used in their adult years.

2. RESOLVED: That in the interest of providing equality of educational opportunity for all students in the Commonwealth, there be a library media center in every school.

3. RESOLVED: That library media centers be recognized as teaching stations and be staffed by certified personnel.

4. RESOLVED: That categorical and discretionary funding patterns be established at all levels of government to assure continued growth in all areas of school library media services.

Program Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That the State Board of Education should mandate that as a requirement for graduation from high school, all students must successfully complete a course in library and media skills.

2. RESOLVED: That the Board of Education give immediate priority to the establishment of a Bureau of School Libraries, along with appropriate staffing and funding.

3. RESOLVED: That the Commonwealth of Massachusetts mandate standards for school libraries and media centers.

Issue B

How can the Massachusetts Foundation for Humanities and Public Policy share responsibility for improving library service in Massachusetts?

Program Recommendations

1. Whereas the Massachusetts Foundation for Humanities and Public Policy has been authorized by the National Endowment for the Humanities to expand its programs, therefore be it

   RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services request the Foundation to permit libraries and archives to apply for grants to increase public access to their collections.

Issue C

What is the state's role in keeping Massachusetts libraries informed of all funding resources?

Program Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That, as part of the implementation of court reform in this state, the county law libraries in the Commonwealth should be brought under the administration of the judicial branch and be funded as part of the judicial appropriation. Furthermore, be it

   RESOLVED: That those law libraries funded by public funds be available to the public.

2. RESOLVED: That because tax financing of public libraries results in less adequate service for communities with the smallest tax bases, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts should augment the present per capita state aid formula to provide for compensatory allocations to economically disadvantaged areas for the purposes of equalizing the quality of library services available throughout the state.

*3. RESOLVED: That the Board of Library Commissioners should increase the monitoring of the development of financail resources for libraries and take an active role in keeping all Massachusetts libraries abreast of all federal, state, and private funding resources, and provide staff assistance to aid individual librarians and interested citizens in the development of quality grant proposals.

4. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services support House Bill 3578 in its original form.

5. RESOLVED: That the General Court of Massachusetts should provide funding at a level consistent with systematically documented needs to implement Section 19E of Chapter 78 of the General Laws which established "a comprehensive statewide program for the improvement and development of library and media resources of all citizens."

Issue D

Does the state have a responsibility for sponsoring nonprint materials evaluation centers?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the state establish a sytem of regional previewing centers to facilitate the evaluation of non-print materials and equipment before purchase.

TOPIC AREA IV

Ensure basic and continuing education of personnel essential to the implementation of a National Program.

Issue A

Who has responsibility for upgrading library staff in the use of new technologies in libraries?

Policy Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: The Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services calls for all state agencies to support activities related to the upgrading of staff, both professional and lay, in the use of new technologies in libraries.

Issue B

How can library staff be trained to meet the needs of special constituencies?

Policy Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That library staff training programs for disadvantaged people be provided and that librarians and persons from these areas be involved with the preparation of the training program.

TOPIC AREA V

Encourage the private sector (comprising organizations which are not directly tax-supported) to become an active partner in the development of library policy and its national programs.

Issue A

How can cable television and libraries jointly improve the public's access to library and information services?

Policy Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science encourage and support the active participation of public libraries in their communities' licensing process for cable television and that said public libraries actively seek the opportunity and support to serve as the community public access channel.

Issue B

How can be public and private sectors share responsibility for carrying out the federal copyright laws?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That state and national conferences designed to clarify the 1976 federal copyright law be convened.

TOPIC AREA VI

Establish a locus of Federal responsibility charged with implementing the national network and coordinating the National Program under the policy guidance of the National Commission.

Issue A

What should be the role of the National Endowment for the Humanities with regard to libraries?

Policy Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services encourage the Research Division of the National Endowment for the Humanities to institute small grants programs for libraries.

Issue B

Who should have responsibility for developing a national policy on preservation of library materials?

Program Recommendation

*1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services support the development of a national policy for the preservation of library materials; and that the Library of Congress, because it is already concnerned with this issue, be charged with and properly funded for carrying out such a program.

Issue C

What should be the role of the Library of Congress in a national information network?

Policy Recommendation

*1. RESOLVED: The Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services calls for the recognition and affirmation of the role and responsibilities of the Library of Congress as the center of bibliographic control and thus an essential component in an evolving national information network.

TOPIC AREA VII

Plan, develop and implement a nationwide network of library and information service.

Issue A

How can Massachusetts begin to plan for effective participation in a national network?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That as a first step toward this state's effective participation in a national network of information services, the Massachusetts Governor's Conference

on Libraries and Information Services calls upon the Governor to appoint an administrative library commission to identify the library services that are the responsibilities of the federal, state, and local levels of government and to provide for the ways and means of funding these services.

Issue B

How can user access to government documents be improved?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: The Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services calls for legislation requiring bibliographic control of all printed publications produced by the Commonwealth, its counties, cities, towns, and other agencies and providing for the establishment of a machine-readable data base of such documents readily accessible to users.

Issue C

What is the federal government's responsibility for establishing a national information policy?

Policy Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: Given the rapid advance of technology, the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services calls for the White House Conference to initiate a national, and even international, information policy in such crucial fields as standards, funding, privacy, access, and information competency.

Issue D

How can intertype library cooperation be encouraged on all levels?

Program Recommendation

*1. Whereas the bull of support for library resources is at the local and institutional levle, and whereas given the fact that geographic, institutional and political boundaries mean nothing to the individual seeking information, therefore be it

RESOLVED: (1) That systematic research and planning should take place on local, regional, state, and national levels for sharing resources and services; (2) that there be adequate federal aid to encourage, support, and sustain intertype library cooperation; (3) that such cooperation consider existing networks and include an adequate needs assessment to avoid duplication; (4) that such federal aid should augment and enrich already funded programs at all levels; and (5) that such funding be made available to individual libraries, to state libraries and to networks themselves.

Issue E

How can access to health information for all be assured?

Program Recommendation

1. RESOLVED: That health information be made available to all persons residing in the United States, and further that the National Library of Medicine's Regional Medical Library Network be additionally

funded to provide access to health information for all.

TOPIC AREA VIII

Freedom of information

Issue A

How can freedom of information and access to it be assured?

Policy Recommendation

*1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services in endorsing the principals of intellectual freedom expressed in the Library Bill of Rights and the Freedom to Read statement, further RESOLVES that libraries as guardians of the freedom to read have a responsibility to collect and make accessible to all citizens the widest possible variety of materials and points of view, and to contest attempts by individuals or groups to impose their standards or tastes upon library collections by censoring materials or restricting access to them.

TOPIC AREA IX

Miscellaneous--No further action called for

Program Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That plans for the spring (1979) meeting include a provision for new resolutions from the floor and for increasing opportunity for creative interaction.

2. Whereas the released survey does not address the needs of the total population, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That public polling techniques should be employed to determine general public attitudes toward and concerns about library and information services, public and private, especially regarding the adequacy of their services in meeting the needs of the public and that the results of be shared prior to the spring meeting of the Governor's Conference.

Policy Recommendations

1. RESOLVED: That the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services endorses the choice of the White House Conference meeting site, as one of the few places in Washington, D.C. that is accessible to physically handicapped persons.

2. Wheras the Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services has today chosen its delegates and alternates to the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science, therefore be it

RESOLVED: That the Governor's Conference declare its unanimous support for this delegation as they undertake to represent the citizens of Massachusetts at the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Science.

VI Delegates to the National White House Conference

The Massachusetts Governor's Conference elected its White House delegates by a two-phased secret balloting procedure. The first part of the balloting took place by mail between the two sessions of the Conference. All delegates expressing interest in attending the White House Conference were placed on a slate of nominees, from which the entire delegation selected a total of 16 lay and 8 library delegates to be presented as a slate at the March 27 final session.

The CAC voted that the Conference Chairman Channing L. Bete, Jr. should be a lay delegate to the White House Conference and should serve as chairman of the delegation. On March 27, Massachusetts delegates elected the final slate of White House delegates after hearing two-minutes speeches by each of them on why they felt that they should represent the Commonwealth in Washington. The final slate of delegates includes three blacks and one blind person. Professions represented by the lay delegates and alternates include three homemakers, two students, a minister, two educators, an attorney, the state director of literacy volunteers, two businesspersons and a vocational rehabilitation counselor. Library delegates and alternates encompass the state library development agency, school libraries, public academic libraries, public libraries, a trustee, and library education.

A complete listing of the White House delegates, their hometowns and present work affiliations follows:

CHAIRMAN

Channing L. Bete, Jr. Greenfield	President The Channing L. Bete Company, Greenfield

LAY DELEGATES

Rev. John M. Benbow Cohasset	Minister Second Congregational Church, Cohasset
Kathleen Furlani South Hadley	Student Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley
Claire Gingras Belchertown	Homemaker and Mother
Ming Ivory North Falmouth	Graduate Student Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge
Janet R. London Boylston	Director Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts, Worcester

Dr. Jesse L. Parks Springfield	Coordinator of Graduate Studies in Physical Education, Springfield College, Springfield
Dorothy J. Pryor Springfield	Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Officer Springfield Technical Community College, Springfield
Daniel F. Toomey Holden	Assistant District Attorney, District Attorney's Office, Worcester

LAY ALTERNATES

Frances M. Evans Belchertown	Homemaker
Felice Forrest Boston	Library Services Manager Little, Brown & Company, Boston
Beatrice E. Lingley Shrewsbury	Homemaker
Elizabeth Moltrup Cambridge	Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission Quincy

LIBRARY DELEGATES

Alice M. Cahill Brighton	Retired Acting Director Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, Boston
Barbara Clark Elam Dorchester	Co-Librarian-in-Charge Boston Public Schools Library Program, Dorchester
Peter Fenton Newton Highlands	Chief Librarian Boston State College Library, Boston
Nancy C. Jacobson Andover	Director Memorial Hall Library, Andover

LIBRARY ALTERNATES

J. Worth Estes, M.D. (Trustee) Westwood	Associate Professor of Pharmacology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston
Robert D. Stueart, Ph.D. Wellesley	Dean Simmons College Graduate School of Library Science, Boston

VII Post State Conference Activity

In view of the relatively large number of resolutions passed by the delegates to the Governor's Conference, the delegates were asked to help set its importance. Once this has been done, a small committee headed by Lydia R. Goodhue of Wellesley, a civic leader and member of the CAC, will develop an "action manual".

The Conference chairman has volunteered the services of his press to print some 10,000 copies of this action manual to be distributed widely throughout the Commonwealth. The state library development agency, the Board of Library Commissioners, which supported the Governor's Conference with staff and resources throughout its planning and implementation process, has also received copies of the resolutions passed and will receive this action manual. In addition, a set of the resolutions was presented to Governor Edward J. King for his attention and action on relevant resolutions. Follow-up with Governor King is planned.

To inform the public about the results of the Governor's Conference, the Board of Library Commissioner's publication, now called Currents, (formerly MediaWrite) will be used. Articles on the election of the White House delegates and the top priority resolutions will be scheduled in this publication which distributed widely throughout the state. Additional press releases will be developed and distributed to key publications in the state.

Members of the Core Committee, on which are represented 10 of the critical library and information groups in the Commonwealth, will be asked to address themselves to the issues raised by the delegates. A booklet called "Libraries for the People--An Action Manual" will be disseminated to these groups and to key people, such as legislators and elected officials, throughout the state.

The White House delegates from Massachusetts will be holding several planning meetings prior to the White House Conference to discuss the priorities set by the entire delegation on the resolutions that they will be carrying to Washington. These meetings will be called by the Chairman and scheduled at the convenience of all concerned. In addition to statewide meetings for the preparation of Massachusetts delegates, it is possible that library interest groups will be holding regional or state meetings to which these delegates will be invited.

VIII Evaluation

Analysis of the eight-five evaluation forms submitted by delegates indicates that they considered the two-day conference relatively successful. Summaries of the responses capable of mathematical representation appear in Appendix Q.

With the exception of the questions involving sessions (8, 9 and 10), the percentages were based on the total number of forms in each category--lay, library, or combined. In the case of sessions, the absence of an entry was construed to mean that the person was not present and that the form should not be included in the total on which the percentage was based. Percentages were omitted where multiple responses would make them less meaningful.

A study of the comments in questions allowing unstructured responses reveals overlap of opinions on various characteristics and procedures of the conference. Because of the subjective nature of entries, all percentages are approximate.

Question 13--Outstanding Features

Over 40% mentioned the opportunity to meet and share ideas while 15% cited organization and preliminary planning. Next on line at 7% each were the workshops and John Berry's speech. From 5 to 6% pointed out the conscientiousness, good will, and interest of of participates and the Chairman's acceptions of the procedures for a grassroots resolutions. Speakers were mentioned as a group or as individuals by a total of 16%. Also mentioned as positive characteristics were the informal interaction of delegates and the information and resources available.

Question 14--Weakest Feature

The overwhelming choice was insufficient time noted by 37%, both for absorption of materials and discussion. 9% complained of the extreme length of the opening session and the excess of introductions. Other weakness noted by 7% were inadequate preparation of delegates, inadequacy of workshops, prepackaged model resoulutions, and the absence of preliminary hearings.

A selection of individual responses covered quality of position and background papers, role of observers, legibility of badges, inadequate information on badges, division of time between local and national issues, time lapse between workshop and voting, and publicity.

Many of the criticisms took opposite positions: more exhibits versus no exhibits, no prepackaged resolutions versus better model resolutions, fewer topics versus a shopping list of unanswered topics, more national issues versus more local issues. Respondents from

each group (community leaders, special interest representatives, public librarians, academic and special libraries, trustees) registered complaints that the other groups had dominated the conference.

Question 16--Areas not covered

Individual respondents listed staff organization, collective bargaining, and strategies for attracting non-users. Most of the other topics listed had been discussed in workshops and in many cases, reflected by resolutions--special needs, publishers, collection development, public relations, participation in governance, library education, role of library, etc. In some cases the delegate may have missed or not been assigned to the workshop covering the topic. In other cases, the delegate may have listed the topic as a means of reemphasizing its importance.

Question 16--Spring Conference

Reflecting conclusions of the initial meeting, 17% suggested that material be distributed in advance. 10% wanted the regional hearings to sustain the intensity and involvement commended as a strong feature of the first meeting. The Spring Conference was also seen as an opportunity for the "grass roots" to define their needs and strengthen citizen participation.

Questionnaire

Several shortcomings became obvious when the questionnaire was tabulated.

Question 1--Delegate Categories

The categories did not provide for publishers, computer specialists, or other groups with close library affiliations and did not always allow clear separation of delegates into lay versus library categories. Members of the Core or Citizen Committee who participated in the planning process could not be isolated.

Question 7--Arrangements

"Arrangements" was variously interpreted as relating to hotel or to workshops.

Question 9--Workshop Introduction

"Introductory speaker" was taken by some to mean speaker at plenary session, by others as chairman of workshop, and by others as both. Many of the respondents made entries under all four of the concurrent workshops indicating misreading of the question or a token appearance at each workshop.

Questions 10 and 16--Workshop d scussion and Exhibits

The wording "expand your knowledge" did not allow a person with a strong background to indicate that his personal knowledge did not expand but that he felt the workshop or exhibit was effective in expanding knowledge of less experienced delegates.

Summary

The material above is detailed in order

to give as fair an estimate as possible of the opinions and reactions of the delegates. Realizing that one person's "outstanding feature" is another's "weakest feature" and that a program, procedure, or attitude may be perceived as more right than wrong, more wrong than right, or simply negligible, it may still be helpful to others planning governor's conferences to consider opinions expressed.

IX. Financial Statement

CONFERENCE BUDGET SUMMARY

		Actual Expenditures			
		Budgeted	Expended to 12 April 1979	Additional Anticipated Expenses	Projected Total
A.	Income:				
	NCLIS Grant	$21,250.00			$21,250.00
	Other Federal Funds	45,000.00			39,326.06[1]
	State Funds				
	Foundation Grant(s)				
	Other (please specify)..Donations	2,765.00			2,765.00
	TOTAL INCOME	$69,015.00			$63,341.06
B.	Expenses:				
	(1) Personnel				
	Consultants (157 person-days)	$15,700.00	$14,287.50	$ 1,412.50	$15,700.00
	Benefits				
	TOTAL PERSONNEL	$15,700.00	$14,287.50	$ 1,412,50	$15,700.00
	(2) Operating Expenses--Pre- & Post-State Conference				
	Travel and Per Diem (staff & committee)	$ 5,000.00	3,143.07	3,000.00[2]	6,143.07
	Rent and Utilities	n/a*	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Communications (telephone, postage, etc.)	3,000.00	2,531,00	2,000.00[3]	4,531.00
	Printing, Reproduction, Graphics.	6,820.25	2,531,00	2,500.00[4]	5,425.19
	Services (computer, copying equipment, etc.)	200.00	274.00	0.00	274.00
	Supplies	100.00	254.00	500.00	754.00
	Equipment	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Other (please specify).essay contest	1,068.84	1,068.84	0.00	1,068.84
	.slide tape	1,179.75	1,179.75	0.00	1,179.75
	TOTAL PRE-/POST-	$17,293.09	$11,375.85	$ 8,000.00	$19,375.85

*n/a stands for not available

	Budgeted	Expended to 12 April 1979	Additional Anticipated Expenses	Projected Total
(3) Conference Costs				
Travel and Per Diem (delegates, staff, committee).....	$22,500.00	$16,503.35	$ 0.00	$16,503.35
Meeting Rooms and Offices (if extra).....	2,000.00	1,918.00	0.00	1,918.00
Printing, Duplicating, Graphics...	1,000.00	1,434.20	0.00	1,434.20
Audiovisual equipment & services..	100.00	134.55	0.00	134.55
Communications.....	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Supplies.....	1,500.00	1,080.61	0.00	1.080.61
Equipment.....	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Other Services.....	1,184.00	162.00	0.00	162.00
Other interpreters for deaf/honoraria..	1,500.00	1,022.50	0.00	1,022.50
WHC alternates.....	6,000.00	0.00	6,000.00	6,000.00
TOTAL CONFERENCE.....	$35,784,00	$22,255.21	$ 6,000.00	$28,254.66
TOTAL EXPENSES.....	$68,852.84	$47,918.56	$15,412.50	$63,331.06

Notes:

1. $5,673.94 returned to LSCA.

2. $3000 anticipated costs for meetings and conferences of the White House delegates prior to the Washington Conference, to include travel, per diem, meeting rooms, meal expenses, and other relevant expenses.

3. $500 anticipated shipping costs of "action manual" from the Channing L. Bete Company to the Governor's Conference, plus $1500 mailing and distribution costs.

4. Anticipated cost of producing and distributing Conference Proceedings/Report.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE PLANNING DOCUMENT OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES

In addition to the purposes and objectives of the Massachusetts Governor's Conference adopted by the CAC, which are listed on page 2, the CAC also took into consideration the following Massachusetts and national issues in its planning document:

A. MASSACHUSETTS ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE

1. The need for Libraries and Information Services:

   a. What contributions do libraries now make to the quality of life?
   b. How should libraries function as community resources, referral centers, educational institutions in therapeutic and rehabilitative programs, and as agents of cultural change?
   c. What more should libraries and other information services contribute?

   from the points of view of:

   Students
   Employed Adults
   Young Adults
   Children, including pre-school
   Elderly
   Handicapped
   Institutionalized
   Disadvantaged: i.e. Unemployed, Underemployed, Limited English-Speaking, Geographically Remote, etc.

2. The needs of Libraries and Information Services:

   a. What legislation is needed to enable libraries to implement all their desirable and feasible goals?
   b. What should be the appropriate roles of federal, state, city, town and regional components of library and information systems; what are the roles of private institutions and private industry?
   c. What standards are needed for library service? What tools are needed for evaluating that service?
   d. How should existing information systems and networks be coordinated and strengthened?

   from the points of view of:

   Library trustees and other policymaking boards
   Funding agencies
   Information specialists
   Education technologists
   Media specialists
   Educators of librarians and information specialists
   Library support agencies
   Public Libraries
   College and university libraries
   School libraries
   Institutional libraries
   Special libraries
   Publishers and commercial information suppliers

e. How should new technologies be sought and exploited to best meet the needs of users of libraries and information services?
f. How should libraries and information services be funded?

B. THERE HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED NATIONAL ISSUES THAT WILL BE CONSIDERED AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE:

1. How can the basic minimum of library and information services, adequate to meet the needs of all local communities, be provided?

2. How can libraries and information services meet the special needs of special constituencies, including the unserved?

3. How can existing statewide resources and systems be strengthened?

4. How can basic and continuing education of personnel essential to the implementation of a National Program for Library and Information Services be provided?

5. How can existing federal programs of library and information service be coordinated?

6. How can the private sector (comprising organizations that are not directly tax-supported) be encouraged to become an active partner in the development of the National Program?

7. What locus of federal responsibility should be charged with implementing the national network and coordinating the National Program under the policy guidance of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science?

8. What must be done to plan, develop, and implement a nationwide network of library and information service?

APPENDIX B

CORE COMMITTEE

Core Committee Members	Representing
Alice M. Cahill, Chairperson	Board of Library Commissioners
Laurel Ackles	Health science libraries
Richard Casabonne	Massachusetts Association of Educational Media
J. Worth Estes, M.D.	Massachusetts Library Trustees Association
Peter Fenton	Massachusetts Council of College Librarians in Public Higher Educational Institutions
Nancy Jacobson	Massachusetts Library Association
Dorothy Ladd	Private academic libraries
Edward D. Pearce	Special Libraries Association
Patricia Sheehan	American Society for Information Science
Robert D. Stueart, Ph. D.	Library education

APPENDIX C

CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Appointed by Governor Michael S. Dukakis on October 5, 1977 (Positions as of December 1978)

OFFICERS

Channing L. Bete, Jr., Chairperson
President, Channing L. Bete Co., Greenfield

J. Worth Estes, M.D., Vice-Chairperson
Associate Professor of Pharmacology, Boston University Medical School, Boston

Laurel Ackles, Secretary
Representing the Hospital Library Group of the New England Library Association

MEMBERS

Irene Barrett, Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
Massachusetts Rehabilitation Center, North Adams

Rev. Father Constantine S. Bebis, Pastor
St. George Greek Orthodox Church, New Bedford

Alice M. Cahill, Former Acting Director (Retired)
Board of Library Commissioners, Boston

Richard Casabonné, Marketing Manager
Cinema Division of United Camera, Boston

Raymond Castro, Publisher
Jornal de Fall River, Fall River

Larry C. Domingues, Young Adult Librarian
Robbins Library, Arlington

M. Ruby Dottin, Director, Upward Bound Program
Southeastern Massachusetts University, Dartmouth

Peter Fenton, Chief Librarian
Boston State College, Boston

Rev. John Fitzpatrick, Director
Deaf Community Center, Framingham

Judith Ganak, Administrator
Palmer & Dodge, Boston

Lydia R. Goodhue, Civic Leader
Wellesley

John F. Harvey, Electronics Engineer
David Clark Company, Inc., Worcester

Garth Hite, Publisher and Vice-President
Atlantic Monthly, Boston

Charles Husbands, Acting Head of the Office of Systems Planning and Research
Harvard University Libraries, Cambridge

Nancy Jacobson, Director
Memorial Hall Library, Andover

Judge George C. Keady, Jr., Senior Partner
Wilson, Keady & Ratner, P.C., Springfield

Dorothy Ladd, Associate Director for Technical Services, Boston University Libraries, Boston

Helen Lavoie, Homemaker and Library Activist
Sandwich

Beatrice Lingley, Docent
Worcester Art Museum, Worcester

Janet London, Director
Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts, Worcester

Edward L. Maguire, Manager of Export Sales
Morrison-Knedsen Company, Duxbury

Richard Marcus, Research Staff
Electronics Systems Laboratory (MIT), Cambridge

Michael McCarroll, Vice-President and General Manager
D.C. Heath Company, Lexington
Also: Member, NCLIS Advisory Committee

Marianne McKeon, Special Education Specialist in Speech and Hearing
Massachusetts Department of Education
Special Education, North Andover

Philip J. McNiff, Director
Boston Public Library, Boston

J. Norman O'Connor, Partner
Donovan & O'Connor, Esqs., Adams

Elizabeth O'Malley, Student
Smith College, Northampton

Paul Parks, Secretary of Educational Affairs
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Edward Pearce, Librarian
Boston Museum of Science, Boston

Lawrence Pickard, Vice-President (Retired)
Boston Broadcasters Inc., WCVB-TV, Needham

Dan C. Pinck
Dan C. Pinck Associates, Belmont

Dorothy Pryor, Affirmative Action Officer
Springfield Technical Community College, Springfield

Patricia Sheehan, Systems Designer
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge

James E. Smith, Representative
House of Representatives/State House, Boston

Sandra J. Souza, Librarian
Massachusetts Correctional Institution, Bridgewater

Robert Stueart, Ph.D., Dean
Simmons College, Graduate School of Library Science, Boston

Lawrence Sullivan, Executive Secretary-Treasurer
Greater Boston Labor Council AFLCIO, Boston

Franklin P. Taplin, Director
Westfield Athenaeum, Westfield

Daniel F. Toomey, Assistant District Attorney
Worcester District Attorney's Office, Worcester

Anna Tremblay, Senior Bookkeeper, Graduate & Continuing Education
North Adams State College, North Adams

Richard W. Trueswell, Professor
University of Massachusetts, Amherst Industrial

Engineering Department, Amherst

Leroy Van Dam, M.D., Anesthesiology-in-Chief
Peter Bent Brigham Hospital, Boston

Mrs. Edmund Wilson
Friends of Libraries, Cape Cod

APPENDIX D

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

The Finance Subcommittee had four major tasks:

1. Formulation of a Budget

The budget was revised at each meeting of the CAC as expenses became known.

2. Exhibits

At the third meeting of the CAC the Finance Subcommittee was given the task of selecting and running the exhibits. We drew up a tentative list of exhibitors, consisting of donors and prospective donors, associations represented on the Core Committee, and exhibitors whose work was felt to fit in with the probable program. In addition, guidelines and application forms were composed.

There was no exhibitor's fee because the exhibits were noncommercial in nature, although exhibitors were required to pay for any necessary telephone connections for computer facilities. The budget allocated funds for a security guard for the exhibit during unattended hours.

Those exhibiting at the Governor's Conference were:

The Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
Library Services for Special Needs Groups
Consumer Health Information
Association of College and Research Libraries, New England Chapter
Massachusetts Library Association
Gaylord Brothers, Inc.
Massachusetts Association for Educational Media
Massachusetts Library Trustees Association
Massachusetts Institute of Technology Electronic Systems Laboratory
New England Library Information Network (NELINET)
Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries
Massachusetts Regional Library System
Simmons Graduate School of Library Science
Special Libraries Association
New England Document Conservation Center

Exhibits were well attended during the free periods of the Governor's Conference. Both exhibitors and conference attendees seemed pleased with the results of the exhibits.

3. Fund-Raising

As one means of fund-raising, we asked members of the CAC for leads to potential donors and received suggestions from about 10 people. We also asked all Core Committee members to approach the organization they represented. We sent fund-raising letters to 119 foundations and to about 60 selected businesses, typically businesses that dealt with libraries. Edward Maguire and George Shea made a fund-raising call that resulted in a donation and Garth Hite successfully solicited funds from two publishers.

The following organizations donated their services or money to the Governor's Conference:

The Channing L. Bete Company, Greenfield
Patients at Bridgewater State Hospital
John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company
Honeywell Information Systems
Houghton-Mifflin Company
Little, Brown and Company
Massachusetts Association for Educational Media
Massachusetts Library Trustees Association
Special Libraries Association

4. Receipt and Disbursement of Funds

A special bank account was established in the name of the Governor's Conference. Actual receipts and disbursement of funds and record-keeping was handled by the Conference Coordinator, Sandra Waddock, at the Board of Library Commissioners.

During the pre-Conference and Conference periods, we received a great deal of support from Sandra Waddock, Eleanor King, Judith Nelligan, George Shea, and others at the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners.

Finance Committee members who attended meetings and helped with Subcommittee duties were Irene Barrett and Anna Tremblay of North Adams, Garth Hite of Boston, who served as Secretary, and Alice Cahill of the Board of Library Commissioners, who drew up the original budget was the invaluable "on the spot" committee member.

* * * * *

CONFERENCE KIT SUBCOMMITTEE

Goal: To produce a kit of materials which will provide conference delegates, observers, and guests with the information necessary for participation in the conference program.

Objectives: To develop a useful and attractive kit folder
To identify appropriate documents which will provide relevant background and program related information
To produce additional documents, if necessary
To arrange for printing of materials
To distribute materials prior to the conference
To organize additional materials for distribution at a resource table in the exhibits area

Planning: The initial consideration by the subcommittee was given to the physical size and format of the kit folder, cost, and length of time needed for printing. Samples of kits were requested from Georgia and Pennsylvania, which had held the only completed state conference at the time. Folders, laminated with two interior pockets, were printed with the title of the conference (Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services) at the top and the theme (Libraries for the People, By the People) and dates (Spring, 1978; Spring, 1979) at the bottom. The conference logo, a blue and gold G with a C enclosed inside, and slogan (No silence, please. Speak up for libraries!), were printed on the center back of the folder. One thousand folders were ordered through the courtesy of the Massachusetts Library Trustees Association and the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company for use at the 1978 conference and at

the follow-up conference in 1979. Graphics for the kits were done by staff members at the Board of Library Commissioners.

Many items were considered by the committee, and a decision was made to organize distribution into three types: 1) Materials for inclusion in the kit to be handed to delegates, observers and guests upon registration at the conference; 2) Several mailings to delegates and discussion leaders in the two months preceding the conference; and, 3) A resource table located in the exhibit area.

In an effort to keep down the bulk of the kit, only materials directly related to the operation of the conference program were to be included. Materials simply describing services without addressing issues were considered inadequate. Essential informational or lengthy background documents which could not be expected to be read by delegates at the conference were sent out in advance mailings. Peripheral materials not directly related to the proceedings but of interest to participants and additional copies of materials sent in advance were assigned to the resource table to be taken as desired.

By March 1, 1978, a listing of materials and scheduled for distribution was determined. Responsibility for producing these was allocated to other subcommittees. Most printing was done by the staff at the Board of Library Commissioners.

The Conference Kit Subcommittee was specifically responsible for the cover letter for the first mailing, editing of the glossary of terms, requesting and organizing the one-page summaries of position papers submitted to the Core Committee by specific library organizations, developing a conference evaluation questionnaire, and arranging for multiple copies of materials for the resource table. In addition, a request to have all materials produced in a cassette format for the blind was met through the efforts of Thomas Ploeg, Consultant for the Blind and Physically Handicapped at the Board of Library Commissioners.

A March 20th deadline was set for all writing assignments. All originals were received by the deadline with the exception of the Fact Sheets for Workshops prepared by individual topic chairmen. As the conference neared, it became evident that these would not be ready for an advance mailing. Unfortunately, they then had to be included in the kit, thus giving delegates insufficient time to read them.

Once all materials were obtained in final form, a tremendous amount of work still had to be done to type, print, collate and prepare everything for mailings and kits. With only a short amount of time, this was efficiently accomplished by the staff of the Board of Library Commissioners and the conference coordinator. Without their efforts, fulfilling our objectives would have been impossible.

ITEMS SENT OR GIVEN TO DELEGATES

Pre-Mailings

1. Informational Materials Sent to Delegates

   A. Cover Letter from Chairman Bete
   B. Summary of NCLIS Booklet

C. Summary of Massachusetts Five-Year Plan
D. Joint Resolution P.L. 93-568
E. Glossary of Terms
F. Letter requesting interest in White House Conference Delegation
G. Planning Document

2. Pre-Registration to Delegates

A. Preliminary Conference Program
B. Specific registration information--hotel, parking, meals, directions, special dietary needs, etc.

3. List of Delegates
Statement of Concerns Booklet

Kit Materials

Received by delegates, dignitaries, guests, and observers upon arrival at Conference:

1. Conference Program
2. List of Delegates
3. Glossary of Terms
4. Summary of Questionnaire Results
5. MediaWrite Issues
6. Parliamentarian's Instructions
7. Winning Essays
8. Souvenir Posters
9. Conference Evaluation Form
10. Hotel and Conference Hints
11. Name Tag
12. Meal Tickets
13. Workshop Assignments
14. Fact Sheets

* * * * *

PROGRAM SUBCOMMITTEE

The Program Subcommittee had as its purpose the formulation and planning for the actual two-day program, which was both to inform voting delegates and to stimulate their involvement in the concerns of libraries. To meet both objectives, it was decided early on that a format that included both speeches by prominent figures and workshops in which delegates could discuss and formulate resolutions was appropriate.

The workshop topics were selected with the idea of keeping the areas for possible discussion as broad as possible within the scope of the selected topic. We felt that it was important that flexibility within the workshop format be maintained so that delegates would feel free to bring in new subjects that they felt were not covered by scheduled topic areas. An initial timetable for the two-day conference was devised and then revised as plans developed.

The schedule was designed to obtain a balance between directing the thoughts and efforts of the delegates and the other extreme of having totally unstructured discussion groups. The format included a 20-30 minute introduction of the content of the topic under consideration and a review of the operating procedure for the workshop. To facilitate discussion, fact sheets were prepared and delivered to delegates as part of their informational kits. Altogether, seven workshops were developed. All delegates attended the first three, but could attend only one of the last four.

Draft resolutions, not intended to limit the discussion, but rather to provide a starting

point, were prepared by some of the workshop leaders. A resolutions committee representative was chosen from among the Participant-Recruitment Subcommittee members, who were evenly distributed in the workshops. These representatives along with library-related delegates from each workshop formed a committee that tied together and eliminated overlapping among the resolutions formulated by delegates in the workshop. The Resolutions Committee was chaired by the Reverend John Fitzpatrick. A listing of workshop chairpersons and leaders in included in Appendix E.

* * * * *

PUBLIC RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

The efforts of the Public Relations Subcommittee were manifold. Nonetheless, we were disappointed with the end results for the April 26-27 Governor's Conference. In totalling up our successes and failures, we have determined that the lack of coverage for the Conference was due in part to the nature of the subject and in part to the lack of a full-time public relations coordination effort.

Planning for the public relations function began early on with the help of the Public Information Unit of the Board of Library Commissioners, headed by George Shea. With input from this unit and the committee members, a conference theme, "Libraries for the People--By the People," and a slogan, "No silence, please. Speak up for Libraries," were developed. Governor's Conference stationery and a logo were also devised and printed as a contribution to the Conference by the Channing L. Bete Company of Greenfield.

To interest students of all ages and their families in the Governor's Conference, we sponsored a successful school essay contest. All of the grammar, middle, junior high, and high schools, public and private, in the Commonwealth were invited to participate in the contest. More than 80, many of them entire systems, agreed to participate. The "Blizzard of '78" came right in the middle of the time when the essays were to be written and submitted and limited the total number received from throughout the state to somewhat under 100. These were, however, distributed widely through the state and were representative of all types of schools and students.

The entire public relations committee, the Conference Coordinator Sandra Waddock, and George Shea participated in judging the essays. Nine winners were finally selected. The students were presented their cash awards and certificate of achievement at a State House Ceremony by Massachusetts Governor Michael S. Dukakis on April 18, 1978. Press releases and photographs of the winners were sent to their local newspapers, along with copies of the prize-winning essays. First prize winners were also introduced at the opening ceremonies of the Governor's Conference. The Essay Contest Winners were:

Elementary: 1st--Tina Klarwasser, Grade 4
Joseph Martin School, North Attleboro
2nd--Ellen Marie Martin, Grade 3
Forest Avenue School, Hudson
3rd--Jennifer Samsel, Grade 5
Kennedy School, Canton

Middle School: 1--Meg Phillips, Grade 9
Wellesley Jr. High School,

Wellesley
2nd--Frances Mitchell, Grade 7
Raymond E. Shaw Memorial
Middle School, Millbury
3rd--Susan Chebookjian, Grade 8
Kennedy Jr. High School,
Waltham

High School: 1st--Scott Matthews, Grade 10
Reading Memorial High School,
Reading
2nd--Judy Bell, Grade 11
Georgetown Jr-Sr High School
Georgetown
3rd--Paige Whitley, Grade 11
Andover High School, Andover

Popular figures in Massachusetts were asked to involve themselves in the Governor's Conference by making public service announcements for television. Delays and other intervening events, however, prevented all but one of these announcements from being made. The one made by Anthony Athanas, owner of Boston's famous Pier 4 Restaurant, was distributed to all the television stations in the state and was well received.

Two posters were developed by the Public Information Unit announcing the Governor's Conference (see Appendix G for one). They were distributed to all public libraries and their branches and individual requests for them were filled. Copies were made available to delegates at a resource table at the Conference and smaller versions of both were printed and included in the Conference Kit as keepsakes for the delegates and observers.

MediaWrite, a publication of the Board of Library Commissioners sent to public libraries and their branches, public and private academic libraries, special libraries, trustees and representatives of all types of media, included feature articles on the Governor's Conference from the November-December issue until the issue following the Conference. A special April 1978 issue, containing only Governor's Conference materials, was printed and distributed during the Conference's first session.

Press releases were distributed about the essay contest winners and the presentation of their awards by the Governor, announcing the Citizens' Advisory Committee appointment as well as the entire list of voting delegates, and announcing the opening of the Conference itself.

Public service announcement were mailed to all the radio stations in the state announcing the Governor's Conference and soliciting public participation in planning the subjects to be discussed.

* * * * *

SITE SELECTION SUBCOMMITTEE

The job of the Site Selection Subcommittee was to determine the site needs of the delegates to the Governor's Conference and make arrangements for them. Because the site itself, the Boston Park Plaza Hotel, had already been chosen, this work consisted of arranging for meals, hotel accommodations, and parking facilities, as well as ensuring that the activities of the Conference were recorded on tape.

Room monitors for workshops were selected from volunteers from the Simmons College

Graduate School of Library Science, signs indicating workshop locations were made, and badges were printed to identify delegates and other attendees. Color coding was used to distinguish delegates from speakers, observers and staff at the Conference.

Accommodations for the handicapped, including interpreters for deaf delegates were coordinated by Thomas Ploeg of the Board of Library Commissioners, Library Services to the Blind and Physically Handicapped program. In addition the hotel was checked for its accessibility to the blind and wheelchair-bound.

* * * * *

PARTICIPANT-RECRUITMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

Delegate selection for the Massachusetts Governor's Conference began by making all members of the CAC voting delegates. Keeping in mind the qualities of this group insofar as they were representative of the population of Massachusetts, we began the process of filling in gaps, geographically, ethnically, professionally, and as representatives of large segments of the citizenry.

Librarian and lay delegate selection was handled separately. Librarians were recommended to the committee by other members of the CAC who knew of them and their qualifications. In addition, we contacted the six largest library related organizations in the state, Massachusetts Library Association, Massachusetts Library Trustees Association, Special Libraries Association, the New England branch of the American Society for Information Science, the Massachusetts Association for Educational Media, and the Association of College and Research Librarians, and invited each to send five representatives to the Governor's Conference as observers.

Lay delegates were chosen somewhat differently. Respondents to a survey of public library users who indicated they were interested in attending the Governor's Conference were sent a letter asking them to submit a statement of concern or a possible resolution for the Governor's Conference. Of those who responded, approximately 35 were chosen as lay delegates.

To enhance statewide representation of all groups within the Commonwealth, we developed a list of organizations representing large segments of the populations. A letter was sent to these organizations asking that they appoint someone to represent their interests as a delegate. If a group turned down the invitation, we invited another group of a similar nature. By this process, and through careful solicitation of people to be present the interests of the institutionalized, blind, deaf and handicapped, minorities and geographical areas, we achieved what we believe to have been an equitable distribution among delegates. In addition, the entire CAC was incorporated into the list of delegates.

By the day of the Conference, 190 persons had agreed to become delegates. Of the 180 who actually registered, 76 were librarians and the rest lay.

* * * * *

REPORT ON THE SPEAK OUTS FOR LIBRARIES

During October 1978, the Governor's Conference held seven regional Speak Outs for Libraries throughout the Commonwealth. To support the Speak Outs and help with the publicity effort, then Governor Michael S. Dukakis proclaimed October as "Library Speak Out Awareness Month." In addition, press releases were sent to local, daily and weekly newspapers across the state; other publicity was mailed to librarians and the chairman of library trustee boards, as well as to major employers throughout the state.

The purposes of the Speak Outs were:

(1) To reach as many users and potential users as possible.
(2) To allow those not present at the Governor's Conference to be heard.
(3) To provide time for reactions to the 32 resolutions already passed and to those pending.
(4) To provide a mechanism for introducing new resolutions not presented at the Governor's Conference in April 1978.

The Speak Outs were held in Worcester, Springfield, Pittsfield, Haverhill, New Bedford, and two in Boston. Many hours of planning effort went into organizing these events, which were run in open hearing format. In each city, two sessions, one from 3-5 and a second from 7-9, were held to permit members of the public who has to work or could not make the Speak Outs during a given time to attend at another time.

Before each session, one of the co-chairpersons made a brief introduction, describing the background of the Governor's Conference and the White House Conference, and explaining their purpose and goals. While the quality of issues discussed at the Speak Outs was excellent, the number of attendees was somewhat disappointing. Attendance ranged from a low of 5 persons to a maximum of 38. Attendees had various explanations for the apparent lack of interest in the Speak Outs; many felt that the disinterest showed general contentment with libraries on the part of users and lack of involvement on the part of nonusers. Still others may have felt that much of the work had already been done and that it was too late to make any contribution to the Governor's Conference.

Four issues dominated the discussion:

(1) Public relations programs to inform constituents about library services.
(2) Establishment of a state agency to represent school library/media centers.
(3) Monitoring community needs for library and information services.
(4) Functional illiteracy.

Other issues that were discussed included funding, personnel training, library accountability, and implementation of a networking policy.

Fourteen new resolutions were developed by the Speak Out Committee acting as a Resolutions Committee following the last Speak Out, all of which were presented to the delegates at the March 27 Conference.

Thanks should go to all of the Speak Out co-chairpersons, to Dudley Weiss, co-superchairperson, to Alice Cahill and Worth Estes who attended most of the Speak Outs with me.

APPENDIX E

WORKSHOP TOPICS AND LEADERS

Workshop for Workshop Leaders

Chairperson:
Ann Heidbreder Eastman, Library Consultant, Member, Citizens' Advisory Committee, White House Conference on Libraries and Information Sciences

TOPIC 1: The Real Roles of the Library: What Should They Be?

Co-Chairpersons:
Franklin P. Taplin, Director, Westfield Athenaeum
Dorothy J. Pryor, Affirmative Action Officer, Springfield Technical Community College

Workshop Leaders:
Margaret J. Arnold, Director, Wellesley Free Library
Helen S. Harding, Director, Gale Free Library
Dennis A. Humphrey, Assistant Director of Education, Department of Corrections
Arthur K. Kissner, Director, Fitchburg Public Library
Ruth M. Peck, West Springfield
Mary Remar, Director of Volunteer Services, Department of Mental Health
Bettye W. Webb, Branch Librarian, Springfield City Library

TOPIC 2: Present and Future Technologies

Chairperson:
Patricia Sheehan, Systems Designer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Workshop Leaders:
Ching-Chih Chen, Assistant Dean, Simmons College School of Library Science
Ronald Diener, Head of Systems, Widener Library of Harvard College Library
Karen Feingold, Librarian, Digital Equipment Corporation
Richard Fletcher, Assistant Humanities Librarian, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Gaylen Kelly, Professor of Educational Media and Technology, Boston University
Liam Kelly, Assistant Director, Boston Public Library
Richard Talbot, Director of Library, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

TOPIC 3: Responsibilities of the Private Sector and the Federal, Regional, and Local Governments

Chairperson:
Philip J. McNiff, Director, Boston Public Library

Workshop Leaders:
Bruce Baker, Administrator, Western Regional Public Library System
Joseph Hopkins, Director, Worcester Free Public Library
Frances Howe, Trustee, The French Library
Robert Maier, Director, Bedford Public Library
David Watkins, Director, Goldfarb Library, Brandeis University
Warren Watson, Director, Thomas Crane Public

Library, Quincy

TOPIC 4: Library Cooperation and Networks

Chairpersons:
Laura Ackles, Representative, Health Science Libraries
Charles Husbands, Systems Librarian Harvard University Library

Workshop Leaders:
Ellen Gartenfeld, Network Coordinator, Community Health Information Network
Barbara Weaver, Administrator, Central Massachusetts Regional Library Systems

TOPIC 5: Library Resources--Buildings and Collections

Chairperson:
William L. Joyce, President, New England Archivists

Workshop Leaders:
William L. Joyce, President, New England Archivists
Howard Lowell, Interim Director, New England Document Conservation Center

TOPIC 6: Copyright

Chairperson:
Michael McCarroll, Vice President, D.C. Heath & Company

Workshop Leader:
William R. Van Gemert, Esq. Counsel, D.C. Heath & Company

TOPIC 7: What Should Be the Relationship Among Users, Libraries and the Private Sector? (publishers, media, producers, jobbers, manufacturers, and the broadcast networks?)

Chairpersons:
Inabeth Miller, Coordinator of Media Services, Watertown Public Schools,
Elena Wilson, Friends of Libraries, Cape Cod

Speakers:
John Flores, Production Director, Watertown Public Schools
Barbara Koven, Trustee, Wellesley Public Library
Carol Kline, Owner, Sundance Paperback Distributors
Vincent J. Canzoneri, Free Lance, Television Educator and Critic

APPENDIX F

COMPILED RESULTS OF SURVEY OF MASSACHUSETTS LIBRARY USERS

by J. Worth Estes, M.D.

The statements below represent abbreviated forms of those used in the orginial questionnaire. They are worded here so as to refer to the respondents' opinions about their own local PUBLIC libraries, unless noted otherwise.

	% AGREE	% DO NOT AGREE	% WITH NO OPINION
1. Staff are sufficiently able to meet my own needs.	93.0	5.1	2.0
2. My own needs for recreational reading are well served.	89.7	8.5	1.8
3. My children's needs are well served.	82.4	8.0	9.6
4. If material I need is not available, the librarian gets it for me from another library.	76.1	8.0	15.9
5. Users should have free access to all printed materials, regardless of sexual content or political content.	75.2	20.1	4.8
6. State should provide more assistance, in form of direct financial aid.	73.0	11.1	15.9
7. State should provide more assistance, in form of books made available for circulation.	73.0	11.7	15.3
3. My own needs for special information (e.g., medical, legal, how-to-do-it, etc.) are well served.	70.9	22.3	6.8
9. My local library is adequate for my community, regardless of the quality of its service for me.	70.6	17.5	11.9
10. Federal government should increase its role in financing and otherwise improving libraries	65.8	20.9	13.3
11. Sometimes I must go to other libraries for some of my information			

		% AGREE	% DO NOT AGREE	% WITH NO OPINION
	needs.	63.8	28.8	7.4
12.	Computer technology would benefit me or my community if it were available in my library.	58.4	9.2	32.5
13.	My library should have more audio-visual materials.	53.3	15.6	31.1
14.	My children's needs are well served in their SCHOOL libraries.	44.3	35.0	20.8
15.	My community provides adequate financial support for its SCHOOL libraries.	28.3	29.2	42.6
16.	My community provides adequate financial support for its PUBLIC libraries.	28.1	41.3	30.6

CITIZEN SURVEY REPORT

March 1, 1979

by

Peter Scott Fellenz, State Project Director
Educational Opportunity Center for Massachusetts
Lay Delegate from Worcester

Peter Low Fenton, Director of Libraries
Boston State College
Library Delegate from Newton Highlands

Method and Rationale

The most frequent criticism of the library survey carried out by the Core Committee, and reported to you at the first meeting of the Governor's Conference last April, was that the questionnaires were distributed through local public libraries and that, as a result, the survey population included only library users rather than a true random sample of the whole population, With this criticism in mind, and with no funds available to hire professional

pollsters, we designed our Citizen's Survey. The name has dual significance since we anticipated volunteer help from the citizen delegates to poll their fellow citizens of Massachusetts about libraries.

We agreed that using the telephone was an acceptable vehicle for contacting a random sample of Massachusetts citizens. We felt that the number of people without telephones who would be disenfranchised was small enough to be insignificant for our purposes, and any other method would involve unacceptably high amounts of time and money to be practical. We agreed that the survey must be brief and to the point, both to facilitate telephone interviewing and to aid in tabulating the results. We were confident that the major concerns about libraries would be likely to surface in any case, and an attempt to gather detailed information would diffuse the results altogether. With these assumptions we drafted four basic questions, designed the interviewer's data sheet, and worked up a set of guidelines for interviewing.

Results and Conclusions

One hundred and forty Massachusetts communities and 650 Massachusetts citizens participated in our survey. We think the diversity of size and location of the communities represents a good cross-section of the Commonwealth.

Question one was "How recently have you visited a library or phoned a library for some information?" The possible answers were: years, months, weeks, days, or never. There were 645 responses to this questions.

Never:	43	=	7%	=	227	= 35%
Years:	184	=	28%			
Months:	142	=	22%			
Weeks:	147	=	23%	=	418	= 65%
Days:	129	=	20%			
	645	=	100%	=	645	= 100%

If we accept the survey as a true random sample of the Massachusetts population, nearly 2/3 of our people are library users. That is, nearly 2/3 of the people interviewed had visited or telephoned a library within months (as opposed to years). The question we must ask ourselves is what is the significance of the 1/3 of our population who apparently do not use libraries? Must these people be served, and at what cost? Can we afford to serve them?

Question two was "When you do use libraries do you use them for: business? pleasure? other reasons?" There were 817 responses to this question. Clearly some people use libraries for several reasons:

Business:	185	=	23%
Pleasure:	431	=	53%
Other:	201	=	24%
	870	=	100%

As we read the comments in the "other" category we noticed that many were for "school work" or "studying". It seems that, if these replies were included in the "business" category a more accurate reflection of the proportion of "serious" vs. "recreational" readers would result. Some other comments include "for my children", "for reference" and "for travel".

Question three asked "Could you share with me any reasons why you do not use libraries?"

There were 678 responses. To tabulate the responses to this open-ended question we selected six broad categories based on a quick reading of the interview sheets. In filling out the matrix the answers were put, when possible, into one of these categories.

Bad Access:	22	=	3%		10%
No Time:	73	=	11%	= 214 =	34%
No Need:	38	=	6%		18%
Own Sources:	81	=	12%		38%
No Response:	314	=	46%	214	=100%
Other:	150	=	22%		

Since most of our respondents to this question are, by definition, infrequent library users we were surprised by the large number of responses to this question (678). Remember that only 227 people responded to question one as less than "yearly" or "never". We can only conclude that many people gave reasons for not using libraries more often.

If we eliminate the "no response" and "other" categories nearly 3/4 of the reasons why people do not use libraries can be attributed to "no time" and "own sources". The former reason is a handy excuse for anything and clearly indicates the relative importance of libraries in the lives of these people. The latter reason is indicative of ignorance about the wealth of materials available in libraries or a limited need for library materials. In any case there is no clear message here for how libraries can attract non-users except that the absence of a hue and cry about specific collections or services could be taken as an endorsement of the status quo. We should add, however, that we tend to get edgy about endorsing the status quo.

Comments in the "other" category are without focus, the most frequent being "I do use libraries" and the others tending toward reasons of ill-health, poor sight, lack of transportation, and varying degrees of illiteracy.

Question four sought helpful suggestions by asking "How do you think libraries could do a better job of meeting your needs?" Again we selected six arbitary categories to help us tabulate the 692 responses.

OK As Is:	247	=	36%		70%
More Materials:	79	=	11%	=354=	22%
Publicity:	14	=	2%		4%
Access:	14	=	2%		4%
No Response:	172	=	25%	354	=100%
Other:	166	=	24%		

Many of the comments in the "other" category reflect a desire for more and better materials, or longer hours of service, or better library funding, which is almost the same thing. Some comments reflect dissatisfaction with personal service and call for more courteous or responsive staff although these appear to be indicative of a local or individual problem as opposed to an indictment of library workers generally. Again, there seems to be no pervasive need that could be remedied across the board to improve library performance in Massachusetts.

We ended the interviews by asking several personal questions to see if we could identify the kinds of people who use of do not use libraries. The responses to these questions were haphazard and it would be unwise to give too much credence to our findings here. None-

theless, some interesting patterns showed up.

By dividing question one respondents into users (monthly, weekly, daily) and non-users (yearly, never) and cross tabulating with the ages given, it appears the regular library users are apt to be younger than non-users. The median age of the user group was 41 to the non-users 48--not a significant difference perhaps.

Similarly, by correlating the same two populations by educational level we find that regular library users tend to have had more formal education--not a surprising result. The non-user group mean education was 12 years, or a high school degree. The user group mean was 17 years, or a college degree plus one post-graduate year. Remember both groups (and particularly the user group) include children still in school which tends to bring the figures down.

Other data that emerged from this portion of the questionnaire showed a predominately white sample population with a heavy tendancy toward female (almost 2 to 1) over male respondents. Although a dozen languages othen than English were claimed to be used in Massachusetts homes, only one comment for library improvement identified the need for more foreign language materials (Greek in Brighton). None of this tells us much about the quality of library services although it may shed some light on who jumps to answer the telephone in Massachusetts homes.

A brief article in the February 1979 issue of American Libraries describes the lifestyles of male and female library users and non-users. The data was extracted from a national marketing survey done by a Chicago advertising agency. One if the more than 200 questions asked in the survey was "How frequently did you use the library in the last year?" The data was tabulated by sex and frequency of use in three categories. A heavy user was defined as one who used the library 12 or more times a year, a moderate user 1 to 11 times, and a non-user less than once a year. This survey describes non-users of both sexes as having traditional, conservative values, with limited interests and few leisure activities. By contrast moderate and heavy library users are decidedly more active--participating in a variety of activities both in the home and in the community.

The article concluded that little can be done to attract "hard-core" non-users to libraries but suggests that specific programs and activities would be successful in increasing the moderate users library activity. We agree! We mention this because of our concern about the one-third of our sample population who seem to be non-users. And we thought you would like to know.

No silence, please!
Speak up for libraries.

Find out about them.

Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services. April 26-27, 1978. Park Plaza Hotel, Boston.

More than 200 delegates, representing people from all walks of life, will be selected to decide the future of Massachusetts libraries for the next generation. You can help in setting those priorities which will then be presented to the White House Conference on Libraries and Information Services, scheduled for the fall of 1979. To learn more about the Conference, write: Massachusetts Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services, 648 Beacon Street, Boston 02215. 1-800-952-7403

APPENDIX H

SPEAK OUT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Superchairpersons

Margaret Murphy, Chief Librarian, U.S. Army Materials and Mechanics Research Center

Dudley A. Weiss, Executive Director, Library Binding Institute

Spring 1979 Conference Chairpersons

Charles Husbands, Acting Head Office of Systems Planning and Research, Harvard University Libraries

Janet London, Director, Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts

Boston 1

Felice Forrest, Library Services Manager, Little, Brown and Company

John Linford, Director, New England Library Information Network

Boston 2

Helen Lavoie, Homemaker and Library Activist

Robert Stueart, Ph.D., Dean, Simmons Graduate School of Library Science

Haverhill

Richard Arcand, Data Manager, Raytheon Corporation

Nancy Jacobson, Director, Memorial Hall Library

New Bedford

M. Ruby Dottin, Director, Upward Bound Program, Southeastern Massachusetts University

Sandra Souza, Librarian, Massachusetts Correctional Institution at Bridgewater

Pittsfield

Isabel Jensen, Vocational-Technical Library, McCann Regional High School

Larry Price, Assistant Director (nondelegate), Berkshire Anthenaeum

Springfield

Constance Clancy, Director, South Hadley Library System

Dorothy J. Pryor, Affirmation Action Officer, Springfield Technical Community College

Worcester

William Joyce, Curator of Manuscripts, American Antiquarian Society

Daniel F. Toomey, Assistant District Attorney, Worcester District Attorney's Office

APPENDIX I

PROGRAM OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Boston Park Plaza Hotel, Boston

Wednesday, April 26, 1978

Time	Event	Speaker
8:30-10:00 A.M.	Registration and Coffee	
9:00 A.M.	Opening of Exhibits	
10:00 A.M.	Welcome	Rev. John R. Aherne, O.S.A., Chairman, Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
	Chairman's Remarks; Introduction of Dignitaries; Introduction of Essay Contest Winners	Channing L. Bete, Jr., Chairman, Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services; President, Channing L. Bete Company
	Greetings of the Commonwealth from the Governor	Paul Parks, Secretary of Educational Affairs (representing Governor Michael S. Dukakis)
	"Libraries in Today's World"	Oscar Handlin, Ph.D., The Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor, Harvard University; Chairman, Harvard University Library Committee
	"The Cutting Edge: Library Services in the Future"	John N. Berry, III, Editor, Library Journal
	"What Public Library Users Think: Report on Survey of Massachusetts Library Users"	J. Worth Estes, M.D., Associate Professor of Pharmacology, Boston University School of Medicine
12:30-2:00 P.M.	Luncheon	

Time	Event	Speaker
	Topic 1 Introduction: The Real Roles of the Library: What Should They Be?	Virginia A. Tashjian, Director Newton Free Library
2:00-3:30 P.M.	Topic 1 Workshops	
4:00-4:20 P.M.	Topic 2 Introduction: Present and Future Technologies	Patricia Sheehan, Systems Designer, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Slide Tape: "The Future is Now: The Promise of Library Technology"
4:20-5:45 P.M.	Topic 2 Workshops	
6:00-7:00 P.M.	Reception and Exhibits	
7:00-9:00 P.M.	Banquet	Chairman: J. Worth Estes, M.D. Boston University School of Medicine
	"The Strobe as an Aid to Our Sluggish Eyes"	Harold E. Edgerton, Sc.D., Institute Professor Emeritus, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
9:00 P.M.	Resolutions Committee Meeting	
	Thursday, April 27, 1979	
8:30-9:00 A.M.	Exhibits and Coffee	
9:00-9:20 A.M.	Topic 3 Introduction: Responsibilities of the Private Sector and the Federal, Regional and Local Governments	Keyes Metcalf, Librarian of Harvard University, Emeritus
9:20-10:45 A.M.	Topic 3 Workshops	

Time	Event	Speaker
10:45-11:00 A.M.	Coffee and Exhibits	
11:00-12:30 P.M.	Concurrent Workshops	
	Topic 4 Introduction: Library Cooperation and Networks	Fay Zipkowitz, Director, Worcester Area Cooperating Libraries
	Topic 5 Introduction: Library Resources: Buildings and Collections	William L. Joyce, President, New England Archivists
	Topic 6 Introduction: Copyright	Michael McCarroll, Vice-President, D.C. Heath Company
	Topic 7 Introduction: What Should Be the Relationship Among Users, Libraries and the Private Sector	Inabeth Miller, Director of Media, Watertown Schools
		Mrs. Edmund Wilson, Friends of Libraries, Cape Cod
12:30-2:00 P.M.	Luncheon	Governor Michael S. Dukakis
	Resolutions Committee Meetings Topics 4, 5, 7	
2:00-5:00 P.M.	Voting Resolutions	
	Plenary Session 6	
	Chairman's Remarks	Channing L. Bete, Jr.
	Vice Chairman's Remarks	J. Worth Estes, M.D.
	Parliamentarian's Instructions	George Demeter, Esq.
	Presentation of Resolutions	
	Discussion and Voting	
	Adjournment	Channing L. Bete, Jr.

PROGRAM OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Mechanics Hall, Worcester

Tuesday, March 27, 1979

Time	Event	Speaker
9:00-9:30 A.M.	Registration and Coffee	
9:30 A.M.	Opening Ceremonies	Channing L. Bete, Jr. Chairperson J. Worth Estes, M.D., Vice Chairperson
	Registration Committee Report	Sandra J. Souza
	Parliamentarian's Instructions	George Demeter, Esq.
	Teller's Committee Report	Edward D. Pearce
9:45 A.M.	Remarks of Library White House Candidates	Alice M. Cahill J. Worth Estes, M.D. Constance Clancy Robert D. Stueart, Ph.D. Nancy Jacobson Sandra J. Souza Barbara Clark Elam Peter Fenton
10:05 A.M.	Results of Citizen Survey	Peter Fenton and Peter Fellenz, Co-chairpersons, Citizen Survey
10:15 A.M.	Remarks of Group I, Lay White House Candidates	Richard Arcand Ming Ivory Elizabeth Moltrup Martin Grossman Daniel Toomey Janet London Beatrice Lingley Kathleen Furlani

Time	Event	Speaker
10:35 A.M.	Report on the Speak Outs for Libraries, October 1978	Margaret (Jims) Murphy, Superchairperson
10:45 A.M.	Remarks of Group II, Lay White House Candidates	Claire Gingras Felice Forrest Dr. Jesse L. Parks Frances Evans Lawrence Sullivan Rev. John Benbow Sylvia Burack Dorothy Pryor
11:00 A.M.	Resolution Deadline	
11:05 A.M.	Voting of Resolutions	
12:00 noon	Luncheon	
1:30-1:45 P.M.	Balloting for White House Delegates	
1:45 P.M.	Call to Order Voting of Resolutions	
2:00 P.M.	Close of Voting	
3:00 P.M.	Coffee Break	
3:15 P.M.	Voting of Resolutions Announcement of White House Delegates and Alternates Closing Ceremonies	
5:00 P.M.	Adjournment	

APPENDIX J

VOTING DELEGATES TO THE MASSACHUSETTS GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Laurel Ackles
Philip C. Ahern
Michele L. Aldrich
Lillian Alpaugh
Barbara Anderson
Richard Arcand

Irene Barrett
Rev. Father Constantine S. Bebis
Edgar Bellefontaine
Rev. John M. Benbow
Channing L. Bete, Jr.
Jack Billington
Beatrice Binns
Robert J. Bjorkman
Constance C. Blanchard
Thomas Blumenthal
Jean Bolz
Margaret Brown
Sylvia K. Burack
Nancy Burkett
Kathryn E. Burnett

Alice M. Cahill
Kathleen Card
Dorothy N. Carlyle
Raymond C. Carroll
Richard Casabonne
William T. Casey
Raymond Castro
Frank Catanzaro
Philip H. Cinis
Constance Clancy
John Clift
Mary Lil Connolly
Mary Lee Cox

Eleanor M. Crowley
Francis J. Curran

Ann Darling
Gerald F. Davis
Elizabeth B. Davis
Larry C. Domingues
M. Ruby Dottin

Jane M. Eastman
Barbara C. Flam
Richard Emmett
J. Worth Estes, M.D.
Frances M. Evans
Robert L. Evensen

Peter Fellenz
Dr. Y. T. Feng
Peter Fenton
Rep. Kevin W. Fitzgerald
Rev. John Fitzpatrick
Jeffrey R. Forbes
Ruth D. Forstot
Albert H. Forsythe, Jr.
Lawrence Fox
Dr. Richard Fox
Rabbi Dr. Hyman R. Friedman
Kathleen Furlani

Judith Ganak
Marjorie A. Gardiner
Claire Gingras
Robin Glabe
Richard Gladstone
Anna Covino Goldenberg
Lydia R. Goodhue

Jane E. Granstrom
Martin Grossman
Mildred G[illegible]erman
Jeanne H. [illegible]winn

Adele M. Hamel
Robert P. Harlow
Ursula W. Harper
Gregory J. Harris
John F. Harvey
John T. Hawkins
Mary A. Heneghan
Marion E. Hewson
Marie A. Hight
Jeanne D. Hill
Kenneth Hills
Garth Hite
Benjamin Hopkins
Joseph S. Hopkins
Mary A. Houghton
Mylo Housen
Billie M. Howes
Dennis Humphrey
Charles Husbands

Nancy B. Isaacs
Ming Ivory

Nancy Jacobson
Colleen C. James
Isabel Jensen
Annie L. Johnson
Irma Y. Johnson
William L. Joyce

Felice Katzenberg
Dr. Gaylen Kelley
Liam M. Kelly
Francis P. Keough
Kathleen Klaes
Joseph Komidar

Dorothy Ladd
Helen Lavoie
Marguerite Lechiaro
C. Robin LeSeur
Elma Lewis
John Linford
Beatrice Lingley
Janet London

Edward L. Maguire
Helen Manning
Richard Marcus
Mildred Mason
Agnes C. Mastalerz
Michael McCarroll
Marianne McKeon
Philip J. McNiff
Inabeth Miller
Elizabeth Moltrup
Major Morris
Joan Morse
Priscilla Moulton
Elaine Moynihan
Elizabeth Mullanzy
Margaret M. Murphy
Sister Suzanne Murphy, S.N.D.
Ruth Muse

Richard Newman
Ronald Nolte
Suzanne R. Noonan
Anne L. Novak

Dr. Francis X. O'Donoghue
Nicholas Olsberg
Elizabeth O'Malley

Rita Paddock
Dr. Jesse L. Parks
Paul Parks
Vermelle Parks

Barbara Patterson
Edward Pearce
Lawrence Pickard
Dan C. Pinck
Bette V. Pickney
Nicholas J. Pizella
Dorothy J. Pryor

Dr. Nicholas Racheotes
Patricia Rabile
Patrice Rafail
Katharine Reichert
Mary Remar
A. Hunter Rineer, Jr.
Esther J. Robbins
Sandra Robertson
Rachel Rosenbaum
Solomon Rosenbaum, Esq.
Stephen Ryer

Donald Saklad
Anna Sanchez
Joan Santeusanio
Janet Schall
Elizabeth Scherr
Robert Scollard
Andrew D. Shrimgeour
Patricia Sheehan

Rep. James E. Smith
Sandra J. Souza
Robert Stueart, Ph.D.
Lawrence Sullivan
Nettie Sumner

Richard J. Talbot
Franklin P. Taplin
A. Anthony Tappe
Virginia A. Tashjian
John Thompson
Richard E. Thompson
Gisela Titman
Daniel F. Toomey
David H. Tousignant
Anna Tremblay
Richard W. Trueswell

Leroy Van Dam, M.D.
Barbara Van Nortwick
Madeline Veasie

Leila Coggins Waters
Dudley A. Weiss
Nada Williston
Elena Wilson

Brian Yates

APPENDIX K

EXCERPTS FROM WELCOMING REMARKS

by: Rev. John R. Aherne, O.S.A.,
Chairman of the Board of Library Commissioners

Welcome, on behalf of the Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners, to each of you who has come here to participate in the Governor's Conference on Libraries and Information Services.

During the next two days you will be called upon to formulate citizen's resolutions directed towards the improvement of library resources and services within the Commonwealth... with such resolutions to be based on each individual's right of access--of equal access--to those elements of the statewide information resource that will satisfy that individual's educational, vocational, cultural, and recreational needs...and will do so regardless of where that individual happens to live, without regard to social or physical disadvantages...and in a manner appropriate to that individual's level of intellectual achievement or potential.

The Board of Library Commissioner's interest and involvement in the planning of this Conference is of long standing, and our role was assigned to us by the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. In the very briefest of terms, that role has been to set in motion the machinery that has resulted in this Conference, to participate--with the National Commission--in the funding of the Conference...and to provide continuing logistical support. Our role has been implemented by our present Acting Director, Miss Alice Cahill, as a designated member of the Core Committee and the subsequent Citizens' Advisory Committee.

Our Board has a deep philosophical commitment to the principles that underlie the purpose and composition of this conference.

The Board is a citizen's board with policy making and decision making responsibilities...its 9 members appointed by the Governor as members at large, and not as representatives of any other agencies of state government or any professional or client interest groups. It maintains a professional staff to interpret and implement its policy decisions.

The Board is, at present, the only agency of state government with statutory authority to coordinate the total library enterprise in the Commonwealth. The language of the statutes is significant. The Board is charged with responsibility to:

> "establish a comprehensive statewide program for improvement and development of library and media resources for all citizens."

In short, our primary responsibility is to the people, not to the library community. We are the designated representatives of the

consumers of library and information services, and such planning and regulatory functions as we exercise and are exercised in behalf of the actual and potential users of libraries and information services.

The concept of independent, citizen control has been the foundation of the public library structure in the state and in this nation, with local boards functioning--to a substantial degree--independent of municipal bureaucracies, making policy decisions to be interpreted and implemented by dedicated and competent professionals.

In a larger sense, this concept has been the foundation of our total public educational structure.

We feel quite strongly the importance of maintaining citizen control over access to the public information resources of the Commonwealth...and this is why we feel that the composition of this conference--two-thirds lay representatives, one-third professional--is entirely proper for its purpose.

It is proper that you participants who are not professional librarians are in a position to control these deliberations and exercise decision-making power...

The National Commission has made clear that it is a state responsibility for the development of statewide networks should rest with the state library administrative agency--in the case of Massachusetts, the Board of Library Commissioners.

APPENDIX L

EXCERPTS FROM GREETINGS OF THE COMMONWEALTH

by: Paul Parks, Secretary of Educational Affairs
(Representing Governor Michael S. Dukakis)

...Everywhere I speak to groups who are within my secretariat, I listen to the same message--that there isn't enough money to do the jobs that have been tacked on to us by mandates of the Commonwealth. We're going to have to be more and more innovative in our approaches to the expenditures of our dollars so that we can make them go as far as we possibly can. I don't see any great amount of money sitting in chests down at the end of the line that we can depend on to change our fiscal and economic circumstances.

Sometimes against adversity, particularly fiscal adversity, we can become tremendously creative and innovative and I suppose that's what we are going to have to do...

I do hope that this will be a very meaningful experience for all of you and I look forward to it being a meaningful experience for me. It's important that we think about how we are going to get people to learn the basic things...and certainly the libraries play a very important role in that piece of skills.

APPENDIX M

LIBRARIES IN TODAY'S WORLD

by: Oscar Handlin, Ph.D., The Carl H. Pforzheimer
University Professor, Harvard University

I feel that in a sense I'm here as the library user. I don't believe that there is anyone in the world who has used libraries more than I have. I left Widener Library at 9:00 o'clock last night. I'll be back there as soon as I can get away from here. I first went into the New York Public Library at the age of five by virtue of my mother's willingness to falsify my age so I could have my own card. And I've been in and out of these institutions ever since.

Libraries over the years have been getting better and better and worse and worse. By that I mean we have more buildings, more books, better librarians, more equipment and despite complaints about costs, our budgets are bigger than they ever were. But from the point of view of the user it's no easier and in some ways much more difficult to use the library than it was 50 years ago. When Keyes Metcalf was the director of the New York Public Library, the research branch was open about 85 hours a week. Now as a trustee, I see with dismay that that great building has had to cut back to something like 45 hours a week. The kinds of uses that I could make of that building, as a student and young person growing up, would be extremely difficult to replicate now. This is not happening through any fault of the staff and not even through the niggardliness of the municipal government or the inadequacy of the endowment, but through the development of sources which are operating inside and outside the library to complicate the problem of putting the resources of the library at the disposal of the users...

First is the simple and unavoidable concomitant of size. When things get bigger and bigger, they get more and more difficult to manage and more and more costly to operate. In the last 60 years, libraries have grown bigger--but also more difficult to operate, encumbered with growing bureaucracies and with the simple task of managing what, if I were a businessman, I would call an increasingly large and complicated inventory. It isn't as easy in a research library now to know where the stuff is and to make it accessible...

We live in an inflationary period...And that means that libraries are in a tough position, like other services that don't charge fees or can't adjust them to the rising level of cost.

Not only are libraries getting bigger, they are getting more expensive. And they are getting all wrapped up with technology. The computer is a blessing and many of the kinds of systems that is has made possible are enormously helpful. But they also change the whole way in which the operation functions and call for continuing and difficult adjust-

ments. Also, the computer involves great dangers. If you made a mistake in choice of one method or another 20 years ago, it was a mistake the consequences of which could be rather easily absorbed. If you make a mistake in a computer system, it can knock you and your budget out of balance for years to come...

It's the same with cooperation. Everyone knows that libraries can no longer be little islands unto themselves, they have to cooperate with one another. Libraries have indeed begun to spin into networks and consortia of various kinds. They are increasingly sophisticated...

In many ways the external problems, namely those related to the people that the libraries serve, are the more important, the tractible, the more demanding of attention. Libraries in the 120 years since they begun to take their modern form, have adjusted to a great many changing social conditions. They worked out ways of serving rural communities, they spread by a variety of techniques the concept of a central library with branches in the suburbs. All these changes have enabled the various kinds of systems with which we work to adapt themselves to various kinds of users...

I wonder how people can use the libraries if they are functionally illiterate, not in the fourth grade, but in the eighth grade or the twelfth grade...I was consulting with a group of publishers (recently) who were wondering how they could contrive high school reading materials that would be rather sophisticated in content but still use not more than fifth or sixth grade vocabulary. It is important that they should do so. Otherwise the products that pass through many of our institutions of instruction simply won't be able to read them.

What happens to the library when a large part of the population is no longer able to use its contents? It's reasonable to blame this change on the media, particularly on television. There's a certain plausibility to that...but it's not solely responsible, nor can we wish it away, however much we may regret what its effects are. Television is a powerful medium. My own experience has convinced me that most of the people involved are concerned about it, and its effect on the public. They are in a bind that prevents them from doing anything, because the source of the force that is driving people from literacy is not in that particular medium but is operating through it, as it also operates through the print media. If we look at newspapers, the periodicals, even many books, we find that precisely the same forces that tend to discourage literacy in the electronic are also operating in the print media...

What are the forces? Look at the Globe, the Times, you see them working their insidious ways there also. They take the form of modes of communication which discourage continuity of thought, come in short little snatches. It isn't only that kids don't know the letters--after a while they get to know the letters. But they're not accustomed to reading even whole paragraphs. They are not accustomed to the idea that a paragraph is part of a chapter, that there is an idea which the words communicate.

That failing is as evident in the print as in the television media. What takes its

place is a sensational headline...(for) most people look at the picture and read or listen to headlines whether they are watching television or reading a newspaper. That change, which is one that has operated through my lifetime, is one that is connected with the kind of society we are--one which encourages sensation, immediate impressions, rather than reflections, rationality, thinking things through and so on.

The media are only media. They are instruments through which various impulses are communicated. But what is being communicated depends on the society which uses these modes of transmission. To the extent that we live in a society and function in a culture that is immediate, sensate and very individualistic, the kinds of things that books and libraries can do, which is to provide another kind of data and another form of communication, will be in adversary posture to the whole society.

This first element is a fact with which you will have to live. How you react to it will have much to do with the fate of libraries in the future.

There is no single way to respond to the position in which you find yourselves. You cannot remake the society...You can't declare war on the culture which exists around. You can adjust to it. It's the nature of that adjustment that's important...

A second kind of adjustment is hidden in that other half of the title of your conference--information services. This is very easy for the library to do, in a way. Because, while our society has all those other things going on , it is also increasingly dependent on highly specialized, often very technical information that it can provide. ...Libraries ought to make research and specific knowledge available to specific users in return for gaining goodwill support, friendship, money from those who use it. I think that libraries would make a terrible mistake if they forget the distinction between information services and the collections of their books which are their primary mission.

An information service is very useful. It gives the user what he's looking for, like having a lot of data on the computer...But a collection of books is something else. A collection of books makes available to readers what they don't already know they are looking for. It makes possible the kinds of discoveries that the Secretary spoke of earlier and that are repeated in the experience of every young person who grew up in connection with libraries. There is, what we must not forget, what the real purpose of the library is, which is to serve as the repository of the accumulated wisdom that's good not only for today but for a long time to come because it's been a long time coming. ...

The quality of a book and the real difference between print and the electronic media is its durability, is the fact that it doesn't exist just for the moment but it exists as a thing in itself for whomever will use it...

That fact that a library has an immediate utility at a moment...is not the reason for holding collections. ...Life is full of compromises and libraries are part of life. I don't suppose libraries ever were or will be in a

position to collect whatever they thought was good and make it available in whatever ways they thought were desirable to users. While compromises and adjustments will be necessary, they will be tolerable as long as those who are involved in running the libraries know what they are <u>really</u> for, are able to distinguish those features of what they do which are instrumental to a purpose, that is towards keeping the library going, and those which are essential to its being, its very character as an institution.

APPENDIX N

THE CUTTING EDGE: LIBRARY SERVICES IN THE FUTURE

by: John N. Berry III, Editor, Library Journal

...Sidney Ditzion, whose book I was forced to read when I went to library school, called libraries "arsenals of a democratic culture." I can't think of a better term for them, ... arsenals, then, let's call them defenders of the culture. That's my view of what libraries are, or should be, and that's my biased view of the level of priority they represent in our country. That means to me, and I hope to you, that the nation's libraries, the Commonwealth's libraries, the town's library, rank in priority with defense, with education, with the services our society provides on the grounds that they are services of high social priority, high enough that we tax ourselves to support them. High social utility, so useful that we tax ourselves to gain access to them. Social utility, so useful that unless we are politically astute, unless we are ready to do battle for funds, unless we can convince government and citizens to recognize that libraries are a great national resource, a vital state agency, a fundamental part of city and town government, there is real danger that they will wither, shrink, and become monuments to a time that appreciated them more.

The future of libraries, then, in my opinion, is directly related to the degree to which we citizens, who agree that they are among our highest social priorities, can convince our national Congress, our State Houses, our neighbors, of that fact. My talk today will discuss that mission...

The public library is one of the last bastions of uncorrupted government. Now, in the wake of Watergate, in the new stench of Koreagate, now as our cities face fiscal collapse, as our public institutions, schools, welfare departments, begin to fail, or lose their connection to their original and exalted missions, libraries remain strong but threatened, threatened by the general downgrading of government and governmental solutions to problems in the minds of a citizenry that pays increasing amounts for government but ends up with worse problems...

I will say that for every major social problem in our society we have created institutions, an institution the mission of which is to solve that problem. And people in 1978 look at those institutions and then they look at the street outside and they wonder why, with all those institutions, and all that government, we still have horrendous problems.

One reason that has happened is described by social scientists as "goal displacement," that is the problem of institutional old age, the problems of running and structuring the institution, the internal problems to which Dr. Handlin referred, replace its mission, which is, after all, to serve people. Commentators like Nader, Illych, Holt, and around here, Jonathan Kozol, have written books that show

us how schools have more to do with the perpetuation of teacher status than education; how welfare departments support more government than they do poor people; how a federal highway program that was supposed to solve transportation problems actually make some of them worse, and in the process corrupted officials in every single state, that is, officials were indicted in every state but Vermont; how it is sometimes better to avoid hospitals because you will come out of them sicker than you entered. Institutions don't always work. Somehow they don't seem to work very often.

Libraries have been lucky. Probably because the numbers of people working in them were not that great, the amount of money involved was not that great and the visibility and notoriety of their leaders was not that great. The other side is, of course, that without that visibility, that importance, we don't get the support we need for them.

Yet I can say with conviction that the library of the future, a future of personal austerity for us, a post-industrial future in which we'll have to learn to live without all our energy consuming appliances, all our conveniences, all our gadgets and gismos, in which the accumulation of products will be much less important than the accumulation of skills, knowledge with which to achieve the same style of life we now have without all the papaphernalia.

The library could just save us, could preserve democracy, could show us how to measure a standard of living in terms of life instead of in terms of money, in terms of peace, happiness and joy instead of accumulations of wealth, goods, property or power...

(I will describe libraries as...) a cultural center, and a community gathering place, for example, for people as well as books. Many libraries are already there, as Dr. Handlin pointed out, as a national resource as important as fossil fuels wherein resides our accumulated cultural wealth. As the key link in a new kind of education, both in and out of our schools--education for information competence, education to make citizens able to identify and solve their own problems, and, as they already are, libraries are the foundation of our formal educational system, central to it. Indeed, without them, we have no educational system, we have only schools. And as a unique information medium, the kind of information medium that a democracy needs, in a society founded on individualism where in town meetings or in halls of Congress we govern ourselves, coming up with mutual solutions only when we can't do it individually, by ourselves.

There are three ways in which libraries will play the central role, if we can show this society that they ought to.

It was Dan Lacey, now a publishing executive at McGraw Hill, who postulated my favorite description of one of the unique missions of the library, particularly the modern library and its modern information function. Lacey compared libraries with other communications media,...one of the essential information sources like newspapers, like television in a democratic society. Lacey said, however, it was a medium with a difference. Let me

paraphrase quickly. The other media all suffer from the mass communications problem. They must, the tv, radio, newspaper, be edited. In most cases this means that from the overwhelming information available to them they must select that small segment, which is worthy of space in a limited number of newsprint pages or time in a half hour broadcast. Consider the re-write desk at most major wire services, the awful sameness of the newspaper front pages, and the almost exact duplication of information on most tv news broadcasts... When you consider them, you realize that the information professionals who are responsible for the news or broadcast information are operating under a set of criteria that produce a particular set of facts, a collection of short news stories for one edition or one broadcast to millions of people.

The library on the other hand has as its mission the collection of every conceivable fact and point of view, not for broadcasting, but in order to allow an individual, one person, to search among the holdings in that infinite warehouse for the fact or opinion that he or she wants. Ideally, in Lacey's postulation, the library provides focus and access to all the knowledge of mankind, unedited, unselected, in order to allow the individual to find his way without constraints to the knowledge he or she needs....

One of the most serious paradoxes facing our society is the fact that despite the fact of the accumulation of so much information--so much that we've labeled it an explosion--there's a very real information famine in our midst, especially at the lower socio-economic levels, for a host of reasons. Most citizens really don't know how to deal with the information problems of life, problems with government, taxes, problems with commerce or health, the basic information problems, of life.....

We are usually at the mercy of what often seems to be a huge conspiracy, a conspiracy against the laity as George Bernard Shaw put it, made up of professions predominantly, and by government and business as well....

We are the most sampled, stratified, statistically described population in history, they've really got the goods on us. What have we got on them? At the practical level, very little. As individuals, we often don't know who to ask, where to go, we rarely know our rights, legally, commercially, medically. We are forced, often on a daily basis, to consult professionals. We pay relatively high fees for very basic information that is directly related to our survival...

When we are poor, we don't have access to professional help. We lose out on many of those necessities, we get cheated, ..unless our problems are urgent, indeed traumatic. We don't have access to even that small complement of public professionals, public health workers, public lawyers, or those wonderful accountants that man the IRS desks at tax time....

Our society has provided some people, what I call the public professionals, to serve those who can't afford the private professional help. We do have social workers and public health programs and teachers; I even count police and firemen among the public professionals. None of these groups has really helped with that

information famine...

But as commentators...point out, we've begun to be concerned, frightened, in fact, at our almost total dependence on professionals. And we've begun to understand that even the public professionals...are often less concerned with our welfare than they are with their earnings.

Illych points out that today that professionals in health, public education, in law, in all kinds of fields, tend to define our needs, and through their expert testimony in our legislature and our courts, convince us that those needs they say we have must be met...met with public funds.

And here's the problem: they also convince public officials that we are incompetent to deal with those issues by ourselves... We can't (solve our own problems) without their help and without their intervention. We are not allowed access to their private stock of information. We must, by law, or by virtue of their control over the information we need, seek them. You and I all know how frustrating that encounter with them can be...

Librarians found out they could help. They found out that the information skills, that other professionals use to search the literatures, law, medicine or whatever, were the same skills that they have learned. They began to see that in libraries were the seeds of public institution manned by "public professionals," who could indeed not only help the citizen find the information that he or she needed, but that ultimately that citizen could be liberated from that helping hand and do it for himself on his or her own...

The most important movement in libraries today, in my opinion, is related to that public professional role. It is called various things, information and referral services, or community information, and from Maine to California it is spreading like a brushfire...

These information centers in libraries also redefined the librarian-user relationship, more in terms of a classic client-professional relationship...to determine the specific and real information need of each client. And more important, they developed follow up mechanisms with agencies to ensure that clients referred for service or information got what they wanted or were referred to an agency that would deliver. They, the librarians, became the user's advocates, information advocates...in terms of advocating every individual's right to know and assessing that individual's need to know as well...

Surely then, one role of the modern public library, one deserving support from government and beginning to get it, is the role roughly equivalent to ombudsman. or in my term, one that will provide public professionals.

But in this age, that's not enough. Built into this system is the danger that our libraries, like so many public institutions, will fall into dysfunction for the same reasons...

Beyond helping citizens to know and

advocating their right to know, libraries must begin to offer much more...in the way of alternatives to the structured or schooled kind of education.

So another role for the library of the future will definitely be to provide that haven for the individual learner, that unstructured but accessible place with the information where the individual can pursue study in a specific area until competence is achieved to his own standards. And in the process that citizen will become information competent as well...

We are lucky in the United States that we have a centuries old tradition of library-building, from our very impoverished beginnings...through the great periods of philanthropy ..through the war years...through poverty and plenty, through affluence and austerity America's great libraries, her research libraries, have in fact just emerged from a period of affluence...

Even the great research libraries (now) have to consider a more selective way to build their collections. By now there is pretty general agreement that these great libraries are not simply local resources. On the other hand, it is agreed that their primary mission still has to be their local constituents...

The key was cooperative arrangements between the great libraries and sometimes including the lesser ones. Networking became the buzzword as you know...

It also became apparent that we needed some orderly way to develop this cooperative and a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science came into being...with the Commission came the stimulus for these great libraries as resources for the whole nation...

Ultimately,... the idea of a national network of libraries was born...The problem became one of knowing what each library owned and whether or not it could be borrowed or copied. Thus was born the idea of a national network preceded by a national bibliographic network... Part of the thrust of this Conference and the White House Conference at which it is aimed at financing that network, s[illegible]t all U.S. libraries will have access to all the materials of all other U.S. libraries, so users, scholarly or not, can tap the library collections of the entire nation, not just their best library near home...

Libraries have already geared up and are cooperating. They do need, however, more funds to build on these early beginnings; they need a policy on which to build. That is why librarians from all over the United States will be discussing national information policy this summer in Chicago....

So who would oppose these dreams...? First, we are not alone in identifying the need for information in the new society we all share. Private industry...sees information as a commodity and would like it treated like other commodities in the marketplace, they would like to package and sell it and to get people to pay for it. They see libraries' provision of it as some sort of competition in what they call the information marketplace...The debate manifested itself in the copyright bill controversy, where the two sides ended up at

loggerheads and the resulting law did continue to protect industry but did give libraries a little more leeway with copyrighted materials...

In my view (fee-based services are) one of the greatest single threats to our tradition of free library service...Before we commit our libraries to any more fee-based services, we must reevaluate this trend, we must ask whether or not the money spent to develop these services is being taken from other free services, preventing the acquisition of other materials, we must determine whether a fee service is adding to our program of limiting access to it to those who can afford to pay. We have to ask whether tax-shy citizens will be willing to pay twice, once in their taxes, and again when they get the service...

We must not let (authorities) desire for security drive us into bad decisions--and I'm sure we won't. But there are difficult battles ahead...

Finally, because it's more sexy, more massive, and more expensive, that national network has appeal at levels that local libraries do not. It won't be difficult to prove its national social utility. But a network is only one component in the service. We have got to be sure that as citizens, taxpayers and library supporters, that in our rush to build this great library network--and certainly we need it--in our rush to make our nation's libraries a truly national library, that we don't forget the people...

Our job as citizens...is to push for the user, for balance, for proper sharing of our nation's information and library dollars... Our citizens need information and they will get it only if we all share the available resources to provide it. New information services, new networks, new roles for libraries, a new agency devoted to service, devoted to information competence for all Americans, to fulfill the library's problem of innovation and education to a society famished for both, to citizens who want to be liberated from the professionals and information monopolies that control their destinies, to students who yearn for freedom of inquiry...We cannot be stopped by a commodity-oriented marketplace mentality; we cannot be stopped by our own insecurities about the future of our own favorite institutions.

We cannot and must not be afraid to advocate the right of citizens to know....

Our favorite institution, the library, is not charismatic, not sexy, but it is vital...Let us pledge together that we will work to give people the tools, the information they need, to find a good life in that society. Let us pledge together to work together to provide all the information, to work toghether to advocate everyone's right to have it, and to open all the closed doors and closed files in America.

APPENDIX O

WHAT LIBRARY USERS THINK: REPORT ON SURVEY OF MASSACHUSETTS LIBRARY USERS

by: J. Worth Estes, M.D., Vice Chairman, Governor's Conference and Associate Professor of Pharmacology, Boston University School of Medicine

I'd now like to turn your attention to the public and school libraries of Massachusetts, as they and their needs are viewed by all users, because, after all, that is what you have been invited here to consider.

According to the best information I could find, Massachusetts appears to be the only one of the 56 states and territories to have undertaken a study of this kind, and in such depth. Of this we can be proud. On the other hand, I, for one, am somewhat disappointed that there will be no similar data from other states, data with which ours can be compared. This nationwide omission will be felt particularly keenly when delegates from all over the country meet at the White House Conference 18 months from now, to formulate national programs for all the states and territories. It is only from solid data that regional differences in library-related needs can be identified and resolved...

In general, the Massachusetts library user is well satisfied that he gets what he wants, and knows that he can get, from the state's public libraries. The survey respondents were especially satisfied with their librarians' abilities to meet users' needs, satisfied with the availability of recreational reading materials, and with children's services. The respondents were somewhat less well satisfied with their libraries' abilities to meet users' needs for specialized kinds of information and reference work.

Books were provided through interlibrary loans to only about 90% of those who could have used them, although the Regional Library System was set up, in part, so that 100%, all of the state's library users, could benefit from interlibrary loan.

Also, only two-thirds of the users took advantage of reciprocal borrowing, or reciprocal in-house use privileges, although all of them should have been able to do so, under existing mechanisms. However, in all fairness, in this case it should be pointed out that not all respondents even knew that such an opportunity is available throughout most of the state.

It is, perhaps, curious that users are happier with the library services that are provided to themselves than with those provided to their communities at large, at least insofar as the respondents could assess their communities' overall needs, and how well they are being met. The consistency of these data among all the communities surveyed suggests that perhaps the state's public libraries are not maximally responsive to the needs of their entire constituencies, and

that the people who replied to the questionnaire are, indeed, reasonably well informed as to what their communities want or need in the way of library services.

Our survey showed that the average Massachusetts library user did not see what benefits might be gained from the introduction of new computer technologies into libraries, or from the acquisition of more audio-visual materials. However, the survey also showed that the respondents admitted that they were poorly informed on that subject; that is, they just plain don't know the value of these technologies. Consequently, we can conclude that although the respondents felt well served with books and, to a lesser extent, with reference services, a third of them did not know what other kinds of library tools and services might be helpful to them, or how. Obviously, this situation requires some public education.

The Conference might, then, address the problem of whether, although the state's satisfaction with its library services is high, should it be even higher? Can we even anticipate being able to please all of the people all of the time? For instance, can we realistically expect 100% of the people to have made use of Interlibrary Loan--we know that it is potentially available to 100% of the state's population--and not expect users to have to visit other libraries at all?

The collective opinion that public and school libraries require increased financial support from community, state, and federal sources is overwhelming. Only a minority did not favor increased tax support for libraries. However, in this respect, too, the respondents admitted to a substantial lack of knowledge, especially about the adequacy of local funding for school and public libraries. And, of course, we haven't heard from those who never even set foot in our libraries, and who can be expected to be unenthusiastic about further demands of their tax dollars.

School library services to their special populations were rated very poorly by the children's parents, whereas satisfaction with public library children's services was rated twice as highly. The Governor's Conference, and the state Board of Education, must, then, surely consider the reasons for this major disparity, and make feasible recommendations for lessening the difference, if that is, in fact, a desirable goal. The Survey does suggest, of course, that inadequate funding of school libraries is one reason for their inadequacy; however, that cannot be the major reason, because funding for public libraries also appears to be insufficient, yet they seem to be providing satisfactory service, on the whole.

So far, the survey data present us with a paradox: How do we reconcile the overall perception of satisfaction with present library services, by a clear majority of library users throughout the state, with their perception of unsatisfactory tax support for libraries? Does the resolution of this problem require us to aim for a 100 percent positive response to items in the questionnaire which provide useful indices of satisfaction with library services?

Among the implications of the data con-

sidered so far are the necessities for libraries to expand their appropriate roles in their respective communities, and, in turn, for members of their communities to be made more completely aware of other possiblities for expanded library services, and of new methods or extents of library funding. Perhaps it is not too far off the mark to suggest that the Survey results support the idea that members of the public need more help in developing their own personal library skills, before they can fully exploit the services and facilities that are already available to them.

By and large, men and women share similar perceptions of overall satisfaction with available library services for themselves. Men tended to be less well satisfied with special services, and with children's services, but in these respects it is possible that the men placed more job-related demands on libraries, and that their wives were more fully aware of their children's needs than men were. Otherwise, men and women agree about the necessity for increased public financial support for libraries, and about the desirability of new computer and audio-visual technologies.

Physically handicapped persons, who comprised almost three percent of the respondents, share the same perceptions of the quality of library services, and of needs for additional state and federal support.

Members of ethnic minorities made up a little over nine percent of the respondents, which is about three times the fraction of the state's population listed as blacks or other non-whites in the 1970 census. In general, the minority respondents held opinions like those expressed by the non-minority respondents. The minority respondents did express a greater demand for more audio-visual materials, which suggests that such tools might find greater utility among such populations, perhaps as a useful supplement to their developing skills in a new language, or among products of the most inadequately supported school systems. However, there are some qualifications to these interpretations; for instance, it is not certain that the minority respondents who want more audio-visual materials do not use English as a first language, or that they are all from educationally deprived backgrounds.

When the Survey results were grouped by the respondents' ages, it became apparent that satisfaction with existing library services increases with age, as does recognition that libraries require increased financial resources. Interlibrary loan does seem to be utilized more often by older than by younger people, which also indicates that library users' needs change as they grow older. This is also consistent with the finding that the respondents' needs for special information were more often satisfied for older than for younger people.

People in the 20 to 40 age bracket were those who most often to go to other libraries for their own needs, presumably students and and younger people just getting started in any of a number of things, including careers, who need all kinds of special information for all kinds of reasons.

Younger respondents were more likely than older ones to think that their libraries should have more audio-visual materials and tools, as might be expected, but the age groups did not differ in their assessments

of the possible benefits of computer technologies.

Different perceptions of how the library can be useful to persons of different ages is also reflected in the frequency with which people of different ages visit their public libraries. People aged 12 to 20 use their libraries most often, about 2½ times a month. Those aged 20 to 40 use their libraries least often, about 1.7 times a month; presumably these people are just beginning their families and careers, and have less time available for visiting libraries.

People over 40 use libraries a little more often, almost twice a month. This is consistent with the usual two-week period over which books can be checked out in most Massachusetts libraries, and it is consistent with the increasing amount of leisure time available after one reaches the age of 40.

It will probably be no surprise to the librarians among you that the people who use public libraries the most often are, in turn, the most satisfied with the library services they receive. The ability of the respondents' local libraries to meet their needs for recreational reading is closely associated with the frequency with which the respondents visit their libraries. On the other hand, the fact that those who use libraries the least are the most dissatisfied with their libraries may reflect the possibility that they use libraries more for special information needs, such as homework assignments, than for recreation.

However, the frequency with which the Survey respondents visit their libraries was not related to their perceptions of either how well their communities support their libraries, or to perceptions of needs for additional state or federal funding. Those who use libraries the least often were the most likely to suggest that the state should provide more books for circulation; this may well reflect a reason for not using libraries more often, that such people do not now find what they want in their local libraries.

There were few differences among the opinions expressed by respondents in the Eastern, Central, and Western Massachusetts Library Regions. People in the Western Region were the most likely to want increased state aid, as dollars or books, while people in the Central Region were the least willing to seek increased tax support. Western Region library users were more likely than those in other areas to rate their libraries as inadequate, but it is not possible to tell just how significant this difference really is.

When the Survey data were analyzed by the size of the respondents' cities and towns, it became clear that people in the largest communities were much less satisfied with their library services than those in smaller communities. However, people in the large cities were more likely to think that their libraries receive adequate tax support; this may indicate that residents of large cities are poorly informed about the tax support of their libraries, or that they are reluctant to spend more tax money for libraries, or that, if tax support is now sufficient, that the staffs of their libraries are not providing adequate service to their users. Any way you look at it, however,

the data suggest that someone in the largest cities and towns needs to be better educated, either the librarians or the people who both use libraries and pay taxes toward their support.

The Survey showed that libraries that are unable to satisfy their users' needs for recreational reading are also unable to meet their users' needs for other kinds of library services. For instance, if the user's recreational reading needs are not being met, neither is his need for special information services, or his children's needs. Then, as you might have expected, users whose needs are not being met also think that their libraries are not being given adequate budgets by their communities.

Similarly, when needs for special informational services are not met, the librarians are very likely to be felt to be inadequate in terms of the quality of service rendered, as is local tax support. In effect, then, the quality of library service is clearly related to the amount of money available to support the quality of service demanded by library users.

The same kinds of relationships were found for children's services as well. It is clear that public libraries that are unable to satisfy children's needs are found in communities that also have unsatisfactory school libraries. Again, it all has to do with money, money for school libraries and money for public libraries.

The need for the state to provide more books for circulation through public libraries is determined largely by the users' actual needs for both recreational reading and for special information materials. The Survey respondents did not ask the state to provide books just because they thought that more books are automatically desirable, but because they need certain kinds that they are not now finding in their local libraries.

By way of contrast, needs for increases in both state and federal financial support for libraries seem to be tied to needs for recreational reading materials, and to needs for improving the quality of professional services; that is, more money is needed if library services are to be improved. In addition, increased state support for libraries seems to be preferable to increased federal support. I can only suppose that this is but a reflection of the growing reluctance to ask Washington, the Congress, and the bureaucracy to foot all possible bills, and to impose the inevitable additional operating rules.

Associated with all this is the corollary finding, another that will come as no surprise to any of you, that you get what you pay for. That is, people who think that their communities do not provide adequate financial support for their libraries are those whose needs are not being well met in those libraries. For instance, those who think that their libraries are not adequately funded by their communities reported that their needs for recreational reading, for special information services, and for children's services are not being satisfied. Consequently, when local funding for libraries is thought to be inadequate, there is more enthusiasm for increases in both state and federal library support.

As I mentioned earlier, poor quality of professional services is most often associated with poor financial support. This is another

example of the principle that you get what you pay for. One clear index of professional performance seems to be utilization of existing Interlibrary Loan services. This is an important facet of the state's Regional Library System, yet it is widely underutilized. Part of the problem seems to be attributable to a reluctance among local librarians to intitiate requests, and part to incomplete filling of requests by the subregional and regional libraries.

I also mentioned earlier that needs for more audio-visual materials seem to rate only a relatively modest priority among the state's public library users, although they are, admittedly, relatively ignorant of potential benefits from such materials. Among those who do agree that they could use more audio-visual materials, there seems to be no special predeliction for assigning those materials to children's services as opposed to services for other age groups. In addition, it seems that those who want more A-V materials recognize that new funds will be needed for them.

As for school libraries, the Survey shows that they, too, tend to be inadequate where local financial support is poor. In fact, when community support for school libraries is poor, so is local support for public libraries. Consequently, the public is most satisfied with either its school or public libraries only when local financial support for those institutions is thought to be adequate.

An overwhelming majority--some 75%--of the survey respondents agree that there should be no limitation on access to politically or sexually controversial material in libraries. This is, of course, entirely consistent with stated policies of both the Massachusetts Library Association and the Massachusetts Library Trustee Association. In the face of this clear mandate from the library-using public, then, there would seem to be little point to trying to reduce the fraction of the public who oppose the concept of "The Freedom to Read."

Yet, if we were to undertake such a task, as a result of this Conference, where would we begin? It would obviously be futile to argue for the Freedom to Read concept in front of the 75% who are already committed to it. People in all age groups were in close agreement on this point, so it would not be helpful to try to convert memebers of any one age category. Neither were opponents of the Freedom to Read concentrated in any one geographical area, or among men or women, or in any particular population size group.

As the most sardonic among us would have expected, it is people who use libraries the least often who are most often opposed to free access to all kinds of potentially controversial materials. That poses a more difficult problem of where and how to direct attempts to win any new support for the Freedom to Read concept. That is, how can we possibly convert people who seldom use libraries that libraries should not restrict access to even the most potentially explosive materials? The Survey data suggest, then, that the vast majority of the state's library users favor the Freedom to Read, and that further attempts at proselytizing would not be expected to be very fruitful, unless, of course, the

minority attempts to overrule the majority.

We have provided you with all this information, to use during the next 30 hours or so, while you are formulating your recommendations for action for libraries of all kinds in Massachusetts.

Our survey represents, then, one aspect of the voice of the people in Massachusetts, the voice of the state's public library users. If you remember that the theme of this Conference is "Libraries for the People--By the People," and if you remember that you, the delegates to this Conference, represent the people of this state, you'll be able to use this Survey results to the best advantage of the next generation, as well as our own.

APPENDIX P

Challenge to the Delegates

by: Governor Michael S. Dukakis, Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Libraries, like motherhood and apple pie used to be one of those American institutions that everyone could agree were good things to have around--not too controversial, and not too expensive. These days, motherhood is hardly a safe topic, and apple pie may be declared dangerous to your health any day now. And now libraries--by calling statewide and national attention to their needs are problems--are risking their niche in the dwindling ranks of good causes easy to espouse. Inevitably, someone is going to say, "We need more money for books," and someone else is going say, "No, we need more money for computers." Either way, you strike out in the popularity sweepstakes.

If libraries are really important, as I believe they are, and if this Conference is really to make an impact on policy and funding, then some very hard-nosed decisions will have to be made this afternoon. Above all, a consensus on priorities must be reached, and the temptation to ask for more of the same must be avoided. Band-aid remedies are not going to solve problems which have been allowed to multiply over years of uncoordinated and piecemeal approaches.

Massachusetts can certainly lay a claim to having the greatest concentration of library and information resources in the country.

But are we in danger of being snowed under by the blizzard of new information increasing every year and by the rising costs of acquiring that information?

How readily available are these resources to the people who need them?

In fact, do all people--workers as well as scholars, the homebound elderly as well as the mobile young--have free and easy access to the information they need to function as citizens?

Our citizens whose taxes support a variety of library services at different levels must be able to get the information they need and the intellectual recreation they desire--regardless of source. We have to improve shared resources from the local level, to the region and to the state. Interstate and national resources have to be developed and improved.

This is going to require the kind of sound planning you are gathered here to begin. It is also going to require a stable source of funds.

This Conference presents the opportunity to propose goals and suggest alternatives to the status quo. The opportunity is unique because the voting delegates are broadly representative and not aligned with any single

interest group. With two-thirds citizen participation, it should be possible to focus on the needs of people rather than of institutions, and to accept the need for consolidation in the face of dwindling fiscal resources.

You who are voting delegates have been carefully chosen to represent all the people of the Commonwealth. I hope you will bring the broadest possible perspective to bear on the issues before you. In taking a fresh and creative approach you will have to balance carefully the ideal of an informed citizenry and the reality of the spiraling costs of government services.

The choices are not easy. The decisions you make will have far reaching effects on the future of library and information services in Massachusetts, and--through your contributions to the White House Conference--throughout the nation. This is a tremendous challenge.

APPENDIX Q

TABULATED RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE, APRIL 26-27, 1978

Respondents*: 50 lay 35 library related

Which type of library do you use most often?**

8	school	(6 lay, 2 lib)
63	public	(43 lay, 20 lib)
30	academic	(17 lay, 13 lib)
10	special	(5 lay, 5 lib)
2	other	(1 lay, 1 lib)
0	none	

How clear were the purposes of this Conference made to the participants?

40%	very clear	(46% lay, 31% lib)
56%	fairly clear	(48% lay, 69% lib)
4%	not clear	(3% lay, .09% lib)

Was your role as a participant made clear?

47%	very clear	(52% lay, 40% lib)
46%	fairly clear	(40% lay, 54% lib)
7%	not clear	(8% lay, 6% lib)

How would you rate the Conference in terms of organization and arrangement?

27%	excellent	(30% lay, 23% lib)
40%	good	(38% lay, 43% lib)
27%	fair	(24% lay, 31% lib)
4%	poor	(6% lay, 0% lib)
2%	no answer	(1% lay, 1% lib)

In terms of the purposes of the Conference, how do you rate the effectiveness of the addresses at the first general session on Wednesday morning?

Handlin

30%	very effective	(37% lay, 21% lib)
48%	effective	(52% lay, 43% lib)
22%	not effective	(11% lay, 36% lib)

Berry

56%	very effective	(71% lay, 33% lib)
37%	effective	(25% lay, 55% lib)
7%	not effective	(4% lay, 12% lib)

Estes

13%	very effective	(13% lay, 13% lib)
51%	effective	(58% lay, 42% lib)
36%	not effective	(29% lay, 45% lib)

*A total of 85 delegates responded returned the evaluation form. Overall breakdown of the responses is included where they are relevant. When percentages do not total 100%, some respondents did not answer a given questionnaire

** Several checked more than one.

All respondents should rate Topics 1, 2 and 3; for Topics 4-7, please rate only the workshop that you attended.

Question: Was the information presented clearly and effectively by the introductory speaker?

Rating in Percentages

Topic	EXCELLENT			GOOD			FAIR			POOR		
	All	Lay	Lib	All	Lay	Lib	All	Lay	Lib	All	Lay	Lib
The Real Role of the Library	29	29	29	44	43	44	17	15	21	10	13	6
Technology	16	16	18	48	51	41	30	27	35	6	6	6
Government and Private Responsibilities	14	13	16	45	47	42	33	31	35	8	9	6

Rating in Raw Numbers

Library Cooperation	5	2	3	9	6	3	4	1	3	1	1	0
Library Resources	3	1	2	16	9	7	4	2	2	2	0	2
Copyright	1	1	0	8	7	1	2	1	1	0	0	0
Users, Libraries & Private Sector	5	4	1	11	8	3	2	1	1	5	3	2

Question: Did the discussion further expand your understanding of present situations and problems to be addressed:

Rating in Percentages

Topic	EXCELLENT			GOOD			FAIR			POOR		
	All	Lay	Lib	All	Lay	Lib	All	Lay	Lib	All	Lay	Lib
The Real Role of the Library	20	27	10	38	41	33	12	7	20	30	25	37
Technology	11	9	14	54	66	38	24	16	34	11	9	14
Government and Private Responsibilities	17	16	19	39	50	22	31	27	37	13	7	22

Rating in Raw Numbers

Library Cooperation	7	4	3	7	6	1	6	3	3	3	1	2
Library Resources	3	2	1	10	5	5	9	7	2	3	1	2
Copyright	1	1	0	9	9	0	4	3	1	2	2	0
Users, Libraries & Private Sector	4	4	0	11	8	3	3	3	1	6	4	0

Have you had adequate opportunities during the conference to express your own concerns about library services?

71%	adequate	(66% lay, 77% lib)
28%	little	(34% lay, 20% lib)
0%	none	
1%	unanswered	(0% lay, 3% lib)

Did you feel satisfied with the concepts and recommendations submitted by your discussion groups for input into the White House Conference?

28%	yes	(34% lay, 20% lib)
64%	partially	(56% lay, 74% lib)
8%	no	(15% lay, 6% lib)

What was the most outstanding feature of the Conference? (See summary for results)

What was the weakest feature of the Conference? (See summary for results)

Did the exhibits expand your knowledge of libraries and information services?

35%	yes	(40% lay, 29% lib)
35%	partially	(38% lay, 31% lib)
26%	no	(20% lay, 34% lib)

If, in your opinion, there was an area of library and information services not covered by the Conference, please identify this area. (See summary for results)

Do you feel satisfied with the resolutions adopted by the Conference at the Plenary Session on Thursday afternoon?

24%	yes	(28% lay, 17% lib)
55%	partially	(50% lay, 63% lib)
14%	no	(14% lay, 14% lib)
7%	unanswered	(8% lay, 6% lib)

Do you think that the Conference as a whole achieved its stated purposes?

26%	yes	(30% lay, 20% lib)
60%	partially	(58% lay, 71% lib)
8%	no	(8% lay, 9% lib)

Have you specific suggestions on subjects or procedures for the follow-up conference in the spring of 1979? (See summary for results)

Has this conference increased your interest in the development and growth of library and information services in Massachusetts?

84%	yes	(92% lay, 72% lib)
7%	no	(4% lay, 17% lib)